

BRILL'S COMPANION TO HESIOD



Edited by
Franco Montanari,
Antonios Rengakos &
Christos Tsagalis

BRILL

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Brill's Companion to Hesiod

Brill's Companion to Hesiod

Edited by

Franco Montanari,
Antonios Rengakos, and Christos Tsagalis



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

On the cover: Gustave Moreau: Hésiode et la Muse, 1891 (RF 1961-7). Paris, musée d'Orsay, don Etienne Blanc

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Brill's Companion to Hesiod / edited by Franco Montanari, Antonios Rengakos, and Christos Tsagalis.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-90-04-17840-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Hesiod--Criticism and interpretation. I. Montanari, Franco. II. Rengakos, Antonios. III. Tsagalis, Christos. IV. Title.

PA4011.B75 2009

881'.01--dc22

2009019813

ISSN 1872-3357

ISBN 978 9004 17840 3

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	VII
Abbreviations	XI
Editors' Introduction	1
Hesiod and the Literary Traditions of the Near East	9
<i>Ian Rutherford</i>	
The Poetry of the <i>Theogony</i>	37
<i>Pietro Pucci</i>	
<i>Works and Days</i> : Tracing the Path to <i>Arete</i>	71
<i>Jenny Strauss Clay</i>	
The Hesiodic Corpus	91
<i>Ettore Cingano</i>	
Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus	131
<i>Christos Tsagalis</i>	
The Language of Hesiod and the <i>Corpus Hesiodeum</i>	179
<i>Albio Cesare Cassio</i>	
Hesiod's Narrative	203
<i>Antonios Rengakos</i>	
Callimachus Hesiodicus Revisited	219
<i>Evina Sistakou</i>	
Hesiod's Style: Towards an Ancient Analysis	253
<i>Richard Hunter</i>	
Hesiod and the Ancient Biographical Traditions	271
<i>Gregory Nagy</i>	
Ancient Scholarship on Hesiod	313
<i>Franco Montanari</i>	
The Latin Reception of Hesiod	343
<i>Gianpiero Rosati</i>	

Bibliography 375

General Index..... 409

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

ALBIO CESARE CASSIO is Professor of Greek and Latin Grammar at the University of Rome "La Sapienza". After working on Attic culture and especially Attic comedy he has become more and more interested in the ancient Greek dialects and the history of the Greek language at large; he has organized conferences on these subjects and has published numerous contributions in Italian and foreign journals. He has often been invited to deliver talks and lectures in Italy and abroad (in recent times the Gray Lectures at Cambridge, May 2006).

ETTORE CINGANO is Professor of Greek Literature at the University Ca' Foscari in Venice. His main interests lie in Greek epic, lyric poetry, and early mythology. He has edited the Pythian odes of Pindar in the Fondazione Valla series and written extensively on lyric and epic fragments. Some of his most recent publications are: "Tradizioni epiche intorno ad Argo da Omero al VI sec. a.C.", in: P. Angeli Bernardini (ed.), *La città di Argo. Mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche. Atti del Convegno Internazionale* (Urbino, 13–15.6.2002), Rome 2004, 59–78; "La tragedia in Grecia", in: G. Guastella (ed.), *Le rinascite della tragedia. Origini classiche e tradizioni europee*, Urbino 2006, 31–84; "La cultura poetica: forme, contesti, dimensione pragmatica", in: M. Giangiulio (ed.), *Il Mondo antico II 3. Grecia e Mediterraneo dall'VIII sec. a.C. all'Età delle guerre persiane*, Rome 2007, 691–723; "Teseo e i Teseidi tra Troia e Atene", in: P. Angeli Bernardini (ed.), *Lepos minore, le tradizioni locali e la poesia arcaica*, Rome 2007, 91–102.

JENNY STRAUSS CLAY is William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of Classics at the University of Virginia and author of *The Wrath of Athena* (1983, reprinted 1996), *The Politics of Olympus* (1989, reprinted 2005), and *Hesiod's Cosmos* (2003) as well as numerous articles on Greek and Roman poetry. She is currently working on the *Iliad*.

RICHARD HUNTER is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Trinity College. His research interests include Hellenistic poetry and its reception in Rome, ancient literary criticism, and the ancient novel. His most recent books are *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge 2005), *The Shadow of Callimachus* (Cambridge 2006), (with Ian Rutherford) *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 2009) and *Critical Moments in Classical Literature* (Cambridge 2009). Many of his essays have been collected in *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception* (Berlin 2008).

FRANCO MONTANARI is Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Genova (Italy). He is a member of international research centers and associations (Fédération Internationale des Associations des Études Classiques-FIEC, International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies-ICPHS, Société Internationale de Bibliographie Classique-SIBC, Fondation Hardt pour l'Étude

de l'Antiquité Classique, Centro Studi sui papiri e i documenti antichi "G. Vitelli" of Florence), Director of the "Centro Italiano dell'Année Philologique" and of the "Aristarchus" project (www.aristarchus.unige.it). He published the new Ancient Greek-Italian Dictionary "GI-Vocabolario della lingua greca" and several scientific works.

GREGORY NAGY is the author of *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979; 2nd ed., with new Introduction, 1999). Other publications include *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens* (Harvard University Press 2002), *Homer's Text and Language* (University of Illinois Press 2004), *Homer the Classic* (Harvard University Press 2008), and *Homer the Preclassic* (University of California Press 2009). He co-edited with Stephen A. Mitchell the 40th anniversary second edition of Albert Lord's *The Singer of Tales* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature vol. 24; Harvard University Press, 2000), co-authoring with Mitchell the new Introduction, pp. vii–xxix. Since 2000, he has been the Director of the Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington DC, while continuing to teach at the Harvard campus in Cambridge as the Francis Jones Professor of Classical Greek Literature and Professor of Comparative Literature.

PIETRO PUCCI is Professor of Classics at Cornell University (Ithaca, NY). He is the author of several essays and books on Greek epic, tragedy, and philosophy. His research has focused especially on the poetic tenets of works of literature. His recent books are: *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer* (Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford, 1998); *Xenophon, Socrates' Defence. Introduction and Commentary by Pietro Pucci* (Amsterdam, 2002); *Sofocle Filottete*. A cura di Guido Avezzù e Pietro Pucci, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla (Milan, 2003); *Inno alle Muse: Esiodo, Teogonia, 1–115* (Pisa-Rome, 2007).

ANTONIOS RENGAKOS is Professor of Greek at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. His research interests include Homer, historiography, and Hellenistic poetry. He is co-editor (with Theodore Papanghelis) of the *Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden 2001; 2nd ed. 2008), of *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (with Antonis Tsakmakis; Leiden 2006), and of *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (with Franco Montanari; Geneva 2006). He is also co-editor (with F. Montanari) of the series *Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes* and of the journal *Trends in Classics* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin).

GIANPIERO ROSATI is Professor of Latin literature at the University of Udine. He is the author of *Narciso e Pigmalione* (1983) and numerous other publications on Ovid and Latin literature of the Augustan age and of the early empire. He has contributed (books 4–6) to the commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* that is being published by the Fondazione Valla under the direction of A. Barchiesi.

IAN CHARLES RUTHERFORD, Professor of Greek, University of Reading, author of *Pindar's Paean: a Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford, 2001). Currently working on monographs on Greek state-pilgrimage (*theoria*) and on the relation between Greek and Hittite religion. Major research inter-

ests: Greek poetry, Greek religion, the religions of early Anatolia and relations between Greek and Egyptian literature.

EVINA SISTAKOU is Assistant Professor of Greek Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Her publications include: *Reconstructing the Epic. Cross-Readings of the Trojan Myth in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leuven, 2008) and *The Geography of Callimachus and Hellenistic Avant-Garde Poetry* (Athens 2005, in Modern Greek). Her recent contributions concern the study of Greek epigram, Lycophron, Apollonius, Callimachus and Hellenistic poetics.

CHRISTOS TSAGALIS is Associate Professor of Greek Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. He is the author of *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (Walter de Gruyter 2004), *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Harvard University Press 2008), *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams* (Walter de Gruyter 2008). He co-edited (with N. Bezantakos) the volume *Mousaōn Archōmetha: Hesiod and Archaic Greek Epic* (in Modern Greek, 2006), with A. Rengakos *Prizes and Contests in Homeric Epic* (Athens, 2007) and with A. Markantonatos *Greek Tragedy: Theory and Praxis* (Athens, 2008). He has published on Homer, Hesiod, historiography, and Greek epigram.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AEL Ancient Egyptian Literature, see M. Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context. A Study of Demotic Instructions* (Göttingen 1983)
- BWL Babylonian Wisdom Literature, see W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford 1960)
- CANE J. Sasson ed., *Civilisations of the Ancient Near East* (New York NY 1995)
- CEG P.A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.* (Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1983)
- CHD *The Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, by Hans Gustav Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner (Chicago IL 1980–2005)
- CoS1 W. Hallo ed., *The Context of Scripture 1. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (Leiden 1997)
- CPF *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici greci e latini* (Florence 1989–)
- ETCSL *Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature*
(<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/>)
- HE A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965)
- HEG J. Tischler (ed.), *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck, 1977–)
- LGGA *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi*, directed by F. Montanari, W. Lapini, F. Montana, L. Pagani, <http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga>
- LOAE W.K. Simpson ed., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt* (New Haven 2003)
- PMG D.L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1963)
- PMGF M. Davies, *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1996)
- SSH H. Lloyd-Jones, *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici* (Berlin/New York 2005)
- SVF *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, ed. by H. von Arnim (Leipzig 1903–1924)

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

These last years have seen an increasing interest in Hesiodic poetry. Scholars have recently studied in thought-provoking monographs the narrative voice in the *Theogony* (Stoddard 2004), the complementarity of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* (Clay 2003), and the extended proem of the *Theogony* (Pucci 2007). Two major works (Hirschberger 2004, Hunter 2005a) have also enriched and deepened our knowledge of a fascinating, albeit lesser known and fragmentary, Hesiodic work, the *Catalogue of Women*. Significant progress has also been made with respect to the classification, organization of material, and availability for classical scholars of comparative data concerning Near Eastern and Indo-European literature by the monumental contributions of Martin West (*The East Face of Helicon*, Oxford 1997 / *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 2007), whose immensely learned commentaries on the *Theogony* (Oxford 1966), *Works and Days* (Oxford 1978), and *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985) had already laid the necessary groundwork for all future research in the field of Hesiodic poetry. The entire Hesiodic corpus has also been edited, translated and commented by Graziano Arrighetti (1998).

This growing interest in Hesiod has not yet been mapped out in a single, comprehensive work in the English language. In fact, it is noteworthy that, despite the predominance of English as the philological *lingua franca* of our times, collections of essays on the entire corpus of Hesiodic poetry exist only in other European languages: a volume dedicated to Hesiodic poetry and its influence appeared in the *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* as early as 1962 and a collection of essays on Hesiod in the series *Wege der Forschung* was published in 1966. The only relatively recent companion to Hesiod exists in French (*Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille 1996).

In light of this, a *Companion to Hesiod* offering a panorama of the current state of research with respect to major aspects of Hesiodic poetry has long been needed. Our main concern as editors is to provide readers with a view of the entire span of approaches to Hesiod. We have opted for comprehensiveness and accuracy, and have allowed, if not welcomed, the expression of divergent trends and conflicting voices, in the hope that both those less familiar with Hesiodic poetry and specialists

alike will find here fresh explorations of traditional issues along with new directions in scholarship.

Ian Rutherford's contribution reflects the growing interest in the multifarious and complex links between ancient Near Eastern traditions and early Greek poetry and culture. Although much light has been shed in the past through the laborious efforts of scholars like Burkert, Walcot, and West, Rutherford's chapter opens new ground by treating a number of thorny methodological issues "not least the problem of how we establish on the basis of parallels between cultures that borrowing took place, and how we compensate for the fact that the surviving evidence for ancient poetry is confined to cultures that wrote poetry down." Rutherford postulates a reconstruction scenario according to which bilingual Greek singers before Hesiod adapted a version of the *Kingship in Heaven Cycle* (KIHC), which they had heard performed in an oriental language (presumably Hurrian or Ugaritic or Phoenician). It is likely that this version was already slightly changed from the version of KIHC known from the Hurro-Hittite texts. Under the influence of Greek religious traditions these bilingual singers inserted their own changes in order to make this version fit the needs of a growing Greek audience.

Pietro Pucci explores the various ways used by Hesiod in the *Theogony* to show that the complex nature of the divine world can only be reflected in his special use of the language of poetry that constantly oscillates between falsehood and truth. This principle of fluctuation and change is traced in the whole of the *Theogony*: the interaction between the divine and human worlds is possible only through difference and instability, which leave their lasting imprint on poetic language but also on Zeus, the chief figure of the poem, since "his distribution of powers will also stabilize his power but also create tensions, gaps, and absences." By laying emphasis on the fact that even after the triumph in the war against the Titans, the new Olympian order is still menaced by new gods, Hesiod puts the Muses' initial song of the victory of Zeus into perspective. Pucci rightly claims that the *Theogony* is clearly marked not just by its extended proem but also by its closure that points to another opening or openings: more adventures full of "rich narratives, unending excitement" but also replete with "a feeling of nostalgia toward the infinitely spreading cosmos of immense Gaia, starry Uranos, and *mêtietà* Zeus."

Jenny Strauss Clay explores the "bewildering farrago of materials" comprising the *Works and Days* and argues that Hesiod's composition takes the form of a double ascent-descent pattern: from the argument for Dike and Hesiod's self-representation as the *panaristos*, we pass to the

argument for work; then follows a second ascent by means of Hesiod's poetic victory at Chalcis, and finally a definitive decline. Such narrative fluctuation is not only internally observed in the *Works and Days* but characterizes the two major works of the Hesiodic corpus when examined cross-textually: from the linear and positive progression of the generations of the gods culminating to Zeus' rule and the creation of a stable cosmic order in the *Theogony*, we pass to the destabilized and complicated world of the *Works and Days*. The gradual confinement in the narrative agenda of this poem is expressed on both a temporal and a spatial register: the different epochs of human history give their place to the myths of Prometheus and the human races, and then to the predictable cycle of the year and, finally, the month. On a spatial level, readers are presented with a gradual tapering of their eyesight as the city is replaced by the *oikos* and then by the human body. Clay convincingly suggests that coming to grips with the puzzling design of the *Works and Days* means that we trace the poem's dual trajectory: we first need to follow Perses' gradual conversion and Zeus' transformations, and then assume our own role as audience.

Ettore Cingano argues that the vast array of poems ascribed to Hesiod and forming part of the Hesiodic corpus can be better understood and contextualized if confronted with the large output of epic poetry traditionally attributed to Homer. Evidence is also given of the circulation of the 'Hesiodic' poems in Greece starting with the 6th cent. BC, of the genesis of the corpus and of the way it was handed down to Alexandria, and how it was edited, commented upon and disputed by the grammarians of the Hellenistic and Imperial age. A survey of the current views on the authenticity of the poems of the corpus is followed by a *précis* of their subject matter.

Christos Tsagalis examines matters pertaining to Hesiodic poetics as suggested or reflected in Hesiodic poetry itself. Some of these issues are generic identity, the scope and aim of composition, internal differentiation between quasi-martial (*Theogony*) and non-martial (*Works and Days*) epic, as well as the creation of a prismatic, sophisticated narrative with multiple temporalities, voices and registers and a distinct and recognizable Hesiodic tone (*Catalogue of Women*). Tsagalis argues that Hesiodic song lays great emphasis on its own special intra-generic identity, on creating an internal narrator (Hesiod) who constantly addresses an internal narratee (Perses) in the *Works and Days*, and on submitting traditional material to a process of both Hellenization and Pan-Hellenism. The *Catalogue of Women* (CW) represents the rather

idiosyncratic combination of an external geographical organization with genealogical material that is fused with non-genealogical lemmata. After a survey of the main features of this poem, Tsagalis examines possible scenarios for the coming into being of this eccentric cross-generic poem and its non-proliferation in the Archaic period, at least in the form of independent compositions.

In a penetrating study of Hesiodic language, Albio Cesare Cassio reconsiders the origins of certain linguistic features and argues that Hesiod's poetic dialect is basically Homeric with a more prominent Ionic element. After thoroughly examining and reevaluating all the available evidence, Cassio puts forward a tempting suggestion: the non-Homeric features of Hesiodic diction are due to the poet's willingness to emphasize the 'Ionicness' of the text, i.e. to look more Homeric than Homer. Without excluding limited borrowings from an Attic poetic tradition (like the expression λαμπράν τε Σελήνην), Cassio puts forward the tentative hypothesis that at least some of the non-Homeric dialect features of Hesiodic poetry may have a literary origin, pointing to the traditions of lyric poetry, whereas others may stem from spoken dialects.

Antonios Rengakos considers the question of narrativity in the Hesiodic corpus. After laying the theoretical foundations and stressing the necessary *caveats* for such an undertaking, he argues that only the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* can be considered as more or less narrative texts. The author examines the narrative techniques of these two major works of the Hesiodic corpus and sheds light on the similarities and differences of Hesiodic narrative in comparison to Homeric narrative.

Evina Sistakou reconsiders the Hesiodic influence on Callimachus. Her aim is primarily to revisit well-known 'Hesiodic' passages from modern theoretical angles, and discuss new ones, in order to re-assess to what extent Callimachus really was 'Hesiodicus'. The paper is divided into three sections, each one of which deals with a key aspect of Hesiodic reception by Callimachus: the formation of a poetic voice under the influence of the *Theogony*-voice in the *Aitia* and the *Works and Days*-voice in the *Iambi*; the working of Hesiodic myths from the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue of Women* into the hymns; and the challenging of the Hesiodic ideal of divine punishment in the *Bath of Pallas* and the *Hymn to Demeter*.

Richard Hunter discusses ancient views about Hesiodic style. He argues that some ancient rhetoricians would have regarded Hesiod as the typical example of the *middle* or *florid* style in the wake both of the fact that Hesiod had to be different from Homer, and because of

"a programmatic interpretation of Hesiod's own verses." Hunter claims that the aim of the traditional contrast between Homer and Hesiod in Callimachus epigram 27 (Pfeiffer), which reflects the vivid debate about the importance of Hesiod for Hellenistic poetry, is not to congratulate Aratus for choosing Hesiod rather than Homer, but to accentuate "Aratus' stylistic affiliations to Hesiod, by noting that there was a grander style, the Homeric, which he could have used, but did not". After turning his attention on ancient critics like Demetrius, Longinus, Dionysius, and Hermogenes, Hunter suggests that certain literary features such as metaphor, compound nouns and adjectives, and poetical and rhetorical figures may have been considered typical of a given style but were found in other styles also. Seen from this vantage point, traditional features attested in the *Works and Days* gave this Hesiodic poem a special stylistic color, which was considered to be un-Homeric, given that in antiquity Hesiod's fate was always linked to that of his great rival.

Gregory Nagy examines what is said about the life and times of the poet Hesiod in two sets of ancient sources, the actual poetry ascribed to Hesiod and a group of ancient texts that were external to that poetry. By examining both Greek biographical traditions and comparing them with medieval Provençal and medieval Persian poetic traditions, Nagy argues that the "Life of Hesiod" traditions reflect the making of myths about the performances of Hesiodic poetry. In this light, the persona of Hesiod undergoes a constant change: from being permanently stationed in Boeotian Ascra as a shepherd with expert knowledge on farming and herding but virtually ignorant of the sea, he becomes a *poeta vagante*, a wandering poet, who travels from city to city, competes with other poets in public performances, and even dares to sail to holy Delos and rival the great poet Homer. Nagy reads certain features of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (*Vita* 2) as indicating the mutable perceptions concerning Hesiod and Homer over time: so, Hesiod's association with royal authority in both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* is consonant with the democratic era of Athens, "at a time when Homeric poetry eclipsed Hesiodic poetry as the program, as it were, of the Panathenaia." In later times, Hesiodic royalism is replaced by anti-royalism and his, by now traditional, connection to the countryside is explained as a metaphor for his detachment from the kings. Nagy rightly alerts readers to a fluctuating, even evolutionary interpretive model of the various Hesiods known and cherished in antiquity.

Franco Montanari's contribution reconstructs a broad picture of information concerning ancient scholarship on Hesiod from the beginning

to the Augustan age (i.e. up to the stage represented by the activity of the grammarians Aristonicus and Didymus), with a final part adding a few remarks on the imperial period (*inter alia* Plutarch's important commentary) and the Byzantine age, and on the corpus of the *scholia vetera*. According to the picture delineated in this paper, the most ancient stages of Hesiodic scholarship arose from the peripatetic environment, starting with Aristotle (as was usually the case for the major authors of archaic Greek poetry). Attention seems to have focused on issues of the biography of the poet, his relative chronology with respect to Homer, the authenticity of entire works attributed to him (for instance the *Aspis*, the *Catalogue* and others) or of significant parts, such as the proems of the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. An important chapter of Hesiod's fortune is represented by the crucial role attributed to him in the sphere of philosophy, above all by the Stoics, starting with Zeno, of whom a few fragments are examined. An interesting finding highlighted in the paper is that several questions of textual exegesis and Hesiodic thought, which were raised prior to or outside the Alexandrian philological milieu, sometimes subsequently underwent a veritable reinterpretation and "rewriting" through the use of specifically philological-grammatical concepts and technical terminology.

Gianpiero Rosati offers a detailed presentation of Hesiodic influence on Latin poetry. The author shows that Hesiod was often used as a typical example for metapoetic considerations. The shaping of the poetic persona of individual poets and their initiation to the art of versifying was presented through a Hesiodic lens zooming on the famous *Dichterweihe* of the *Theogony*, sometimes through the intertextual mediation of Callimachus. Under the pressing need to delineate a new beginning for the young Latin literature, early Roman poets effectively turned to Hesiod as the typical example of a rather subjective and autobiographical poetic genre, which—through its detachment from Homeric "objectivity"—offered a more telling example for a form of poetry that would focus on the personality of the poet, discuss problems of a literary character and be constantly preoccupied with moral principles. Another aspect of Hesiodic reception in Latin poetry is based on the opposition between falsehood and truth, which Roman poetry represented not within the framework of an antithesis with Homeric poetry but as a dichotomy between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. Rosati shows how Hesiod became a symbol of a wide variety of rather contradicting themes: he is the poet-mythologist, the originator and the *exemplum* of a tradition of fiction but at the same time of truth, a wisdom poet who sings of gods and their

loves, a poetic emblem of *otium* and nostalgic attitude of idealization of the past but also the archetype of this concept of an ethical-political function of poetry.

It was a cool night of August 2005, in the serene atmosphere of Kurt von Hardt's villa at Geneva (during a conference entitled *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* held in the famous Fondation Hardt and then published in the *Entretiens*, vol. LII, 2006) that we began to conceive this project. From the start it was clear to all three of us that a *Companion to Hesiod* should not simply be a collection of essays but a coherent, wide-ranging, collective work that would cater for different tastes and would give an idea of current developments in Hesiodic studies. We still look back at that night and hope that readers will judge the result of our effort as worthwhile.

In the course of these three and a half years we have incurred many debts to a number of people who have helped us, in various ways, and have made this publication possible. It is extremely gratifying to work with an international team of distinguished scholars who were kind enough to entrust their work to us. With contributions from the UK (Hunter, Rutherford), the US (Clay, Nagy, Pucci), Italy (Cassio, Cingano, Montanari, Rosati), and Greece (Rengakos, Sistakou, Tsagalis), this volume clearly indicates that scholarly interest in Hesiod is alive and well and that by cutting across national borders and philological approaches it truly testifies to the international character of our discipline.

Needless to say, any errors and inaccuracies remaining in this book are our own responsibility. It has been a real privilege to work with the staff of E.J. Brill, in particular with Irene van Rossum and Caroline van Erp; their expertise on all matters is always combined with politeness and readiness to solve practical problems. Lastly, we would like to express our warmest thanks to Fausto Montana, Paola Ascheri, Davide Muratore, Lara Pagani, Serena Perrone for compiling the General Index and to Katherine Hodgson for stylistic refinement.

Genova-Thessaloniki, April 2009

Franco Montanari
 Antonios Rengakos
 Christos Tsagalis

HESIOD AND THE LITERARY TRADITIONS OF THE NEAR EAST¹

IAN RUTHERFORD

1

1.1. *Proem*

More than any other early Greek text, the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* show widespread parallels with the surviving (therefore written) poetry and literature of Western Asia, Egypt and societies even further East, such as Iran and India. Much light has been shed on the subject in recent decades, thanks primarily to the writings of Martin West, Walter Burkert, Peter Walcot and other scholars, who have succeeded in showing that a large number of themes and motifs important in Hesiod can be paralleled in earlier or contemporary (or in some cases later) literary culture from the Ancient Near East and Egypt.² But huge methodological problems still remain, not least that of how we establish on the basis of parallels that borrowing took places, and how we compensate for the fact that the surviving evidence for ancient poetry is confined to cultures that wrote poetry down.

1.2. *Parallels between Hesiod and the Near East*

Key areas in Hesiod where parallels with the Near East have been found are:

1.2.1. “Kingship in Heaven Cycle”³

Many general parallels exist between the representation of the divine world in Hesiod and Greek mythology on the one hand and Near Eastern

¹ Thanks to Robin Lane-Fox.

² Above all West (1997); Burkert (1992) and (2005); Walcot (1966). Mention should also be made of the important contribution of Dörrie (1956).

³ The principal guides are: Hoffner (1998) 40 ff. (translation with introduction); Haas

religion on the other, such as the idea that there are older and more recent generations of gods,⁴ and that in the pantheon, different gods have roles assigned to them by a central god.⁵ But the most significant parallel between Hesiod and the Near East has for sixty years been that between the succession myth in the *Theogony* and the so-called *Kingship in Heaven Cycle* (KIHC), a term applied by modern scholars to a sequence of several anonymous Hittite “songs” attested in Hittite texts from the Hittite royal archives at Hattusa in central Anatolia, but known to have been derived from the Hurrian civilisation of North Syria in the mid 2nd millennium BC.⁶ The basic points of comparison have been pointed out many times, first by the path-breaking Swiss scholar Emile Forrer in 1936.⁷

The opening “song” in KIHC was probably the *Song of Kumarbi*, which narrated the emasculation of the sky-god Anu by Kumarbi, son of Anu’s rival Alalu. Kumarbi, having bitten off Anu’s genitals, then gives birth to the storm-god Tessub and his siblings. Other songs told of adversaries sent against Tessub by Kumarbi, including the sea-monster Hedammu and Ullikummi, a monster made of stone. The Hurrian and Hesiodic narratives are not identical, but too many points of comparison exist between them for it to be possible to deny that a relationship exists. Specifically, there are several general resemblances in relation to the plot:⁸

- i. the first ruler-deity is the Sky;
- ii. the second ruler-deity emasculates the first, with a scythe in Hesiod, by biting in KIHC. Kumarbi is an agricultural deity, and the use of the scythe by Kronos may indicate that he was associated with agriculture as well, though this has been disputed.⁹

(2006: up-to-date survey); Pecchioli-Daddi and Polvani (1990: translation and commentary); Bernabé (1979: translation); Garcia Trabazo (2002: translation and commentary on parts).

⁴ West (1997) 111.

⁵ West (1997) 107, rightly compares Zeus assigning roles to the gods (*Th.* 73 f., 393, 423–428) with Near Eastern texts, especially *Enki and World Order*, where Enki assigns roles to the gods. Notice, however, that the primeval division of the *kosmos* between three gods, who are allotted sky, earth and underworld, which appears in the Babylonian *Atrahasis* epic, and again in Homer’s *Iliad* (Burkert [1992] 88–95; cf. West [1997] 109–110 and 385), is strikingly absent in Hesiod.

⁶ General introductions to Hurro-Hittite literature: Beckman (2005); Archi (1995); Lebrun (1995).

⁷ Forrer (1936). Passed to classicists in Barrett (1946). This link is generally accepted today; the extreme doubts of Mondy (1990) seem unjustifiable.

⁸ On differences, see further section 2.2.1.

⁹ Kronos is an agricultural deity: Nilsson (1951); Kronos is not an agricultural deity:

- iii. the gods of the present generation emerge from the body of the second ruler deity; in KIHC they were conceived there, while in Hesiod they are swallowed after birth;

We may also add

- iv. that gods of the present generation face a challenge from monsters who want to usurp their position: Typhon in Hesiod, Hedammu, Ullikummi and perhaps others in KIHC, although it must be said that Hesiod's Typhon—a monster with multiple serpent heads—is rather unlike any of the divine adversaries in KIHC, especially Ullikummi, who is an animated lump of rock, deaf and dumb. For a snake as a divine adversary a better Anatolian parallel seems to be the myth of Illuyankas from the Hattic-Hittite tradition of central Anatolia. Later Greek traditions about Typhon do, however, seem to contain reminiscences of the Hurro-Hittite myth of Ullikummi.¹⁰

Between Hesiod and KIHC there are also several striking parallels of detail, namely:

- v. the second ruler-deity spits out a stone, which becomes a cult object. In the *Theogony*, this is localised at Delphi as the *omphalos*; in the KIHC this “kunkunuzzi” or “killing” stone, made of diorite or basalt, may end up in the city of Ebla;¹¹
- vi. a crucial role is played in the story by a sharp metal instrument; in the KIHC the gods neutralize Ullikummi by separating his feet from the earth with a copper cutting tool, the same tool that had been used in primeval times to separate earth and sky. In Hesiod Kronos castrates Ouranos with a scythe, which clearly symbolises the separation of earth and sky, since before that point the children of Gaia had been hidden inside her body; in KIHC, by contrast, the separation of earth and sky must have happened long before Kumarbi's revolt against Anu.

Graf (1985) 93, cited in Bremmer (2003) 43 n. 48; another similarity between Kumarbi and Kronos may be that they are associated with “reversed world” scenarios: see below.

¹⁰ See Section 2.2.1.

¹¹ Haas (2002) 235; cf. also West (1997) 294.

- vii. A further god or gods is/are born from the accidental spillage of blood or semen from the act of emasculation; Aphrodite from spillage of Ouranos' blood in Hesiod, the Tigris River in KIHC from semen spat out by Kumarbi onto Mount Kanzura.
- viii. During the fragmentary birth scene, Kumarbi announces he wants to eat his son Tessub, just as Kronos devours his children in Hesiod's account.¹²

The Hurrian KIHC also shows some similarities to West Semitic sources from the Levant. Hurrian texts have been found at Ugarit, and there may well have been influence in one direction or another between the KIHC and the so-called "Baal Cycle" in which Baal fights various adversaries, including the Sea ("Yamm"). Baal's sacred mountain, Mt. Saphon, also features in the Song of Ullikummi as Mt. Hazzi (known to the Greeks as Mt. Kasios), the place from where the gods organize their defence against the monster.¹³ It has even been suggested that the Greek name Typhon could be derived from the semitic Saphon.¹⁴

There was also a Phoenician version,¹⁵ to judge from the words of Philo of Byblos, who attributes to a certain "Sanchuniathon" a mythological narrative involving four generations of a mortal family who are referred to either by Greek equivalents or slightly garbled semitic names (some scepticism about the reliability of this source would be legitimate, but most scholars give it the benefit of the doubt). First comes Elioun-Hypsistos, who dies after an attack by animals, then his son Epigeios-Ouranos, who has four sons of his own by Ge: El/Kronos, Baitylos, Dagon and Atlas; Kronos drives Ouranos out; a pregnant concubine of Ouranos given to Dagon as wife gives birth to Demarous (which seems roughly to parallel the Kumarbi episode). Demarous then fathers Melkathros/Herakles. Kronos' rule is violent and is resisted by Ouranos whom Kronos attacks and castrates. After this, Astarte (daughter of Ouranos), Demarous and Adodos (= the Syrian god Adad) rule, with the consent of Kronos. Here we seem to see traces of a myth of divine kingship similar to the Hurro-Hittite one and perhaps derived from it. The differences are that we have a single line of descent (as in Hesiod)

¹² Hoffner (1998) § 14 (col. ii.43 and 50).

¹³ Translation in Parker (1997); by Dennis Pardee in COS 1, 241–274.

¹⁴ See Bonnet (1987) 133.

¹⁵ West (1966) 24–28; Baumgarten (1981) 238–239; West (1997) 283–286.

rather than two concurrent ones, and the emergence of a new generation in no way neutralizes the previous generations.

Behind all of these forms some scholars have detected Babylonian models. In the Babylonian creation epic *Enuma Elish*, Ea kills his father Apsu (the Subterranean Waters) and is in turn succeeded by his own son Marduk, who goes on to destroy Tiamat (the sea) and other monsters, to secure the Tablet of Destinies and to create the world (here too we have a single line of descent).¹⁶ This parallel was stated forcefully by F.M. Cornford in his unfinished masterpiece *Principium Sapientiae*, which was written in ignorance of the new discoveries from Hattusa.¹⁷ But these similarities are much more schematic, and only sharpen one's sense of how exact the correspondences are between the *Theogony* and the KIHC. A second Babylonian succession myth, the so-called "Harab Myth" or *Theogony of Dunnu*, narrates a much longer sequence of generational conflict between gods, imagined as living in the town of Dunnu.¹⁸ It culminates with the "present generation of gods" (Enlil and Ninurta; Anu was probably mentioned before them in a lacuna). Jacobsen suggests that it might be seen as the "lost Babylonian source" of the Hurro-Hittite and Greek versions, but its present form—a bare outline of generations and events—makes that hypothesis impossible to confirm.¹⁹

If we focus more narrowly on conflict between the Storm-god and a monster, then a broader range of Near Eastern parallels are available, as Peter Haider has recently shown in an excellent study (2005).²⁰

An alternative would be that this is after all Indo-European: one might argue that both KIHC and the *Theogony* reflect an Indo-European theme of divine succession, with KIHC, as we have it in Hittite sources, showing Babylonian influence, most obviously in the figure of Ea, the god of wisdom (who is lacking in Hesiod's *Theogony*). The problem with that hypothesis is that the kingship-in-heaven theme does not seem

¹⁶ See West (1997) 280–283. Translations of *Enuma Elish* in Dalley (2000) and Foster (2005); Foster's translation also in COS 1, 390–402.

¹⁷ Cornford (1952); cf. also Cornford (1950); the author died in 1943. Cornford's significance is appreciated by Vernant (1983) 344–345.

¹⁸ Jacobsen (1984); translation by W.W. Hallo in COS 1, 402–404; first edition: Lambert and Walcot (1965).

¹⁹ Jacobsen (1984) 19.

²⁰ Cf. also Bonnet (1987); Vian (1976) 25–26 suggests parallels also with the Egyptian myth of Horus and Seth who was identified with Typhon in the standard *interpretatio Graeca*, although that identification may itself have been motivated by the fact that the Egyptians had already identified Seth with Baal, the god of Mt. Saphon, worshipped in the Eastern Delta.

particularly well attested in other Indo-European traditions, with the exception of the Typhon-episode (which could be an instance of the Indo-European dragon-slaying theme).²¹

1.2.2. The Eras of Human History

Divine history and human history can be seen as a continuum in Near Eastern societies, and in the area of human history too we find parallels (to some extent they run in parallel, so that different phases of human history are correlated with different divine ones).²² Hesiod's ideas about human history are less well developed than his ideas about divine history, but he gives us a succinct account in the "Four Ages of Man" in the *Works and Days* (109 ff.), in which the wretched fifth generation of iron is contrasted with a succession of utopic and dystopic eras. The First and Second generations seem to represent the good and bad sides of a true Golden Age; in the first, men lived "like gods", while in the second they chose not to sacrifice. The Third and Fourth could be seen as more and less extreme versions of heroic society. The sequence is thus from good to bad and then from bad to good again (and then to bad again in the present fifth age), and it is no coincidence that it is members of the first and fourth generation that end up immortalized, the first as spirits in the underworld, and the fourth on the isles of the blessed.²³ Alongside this we have the Prometheus narratives in the *Works and Days* and *Theogony*, which seem to imply a two way movement in the history of mankind: Prometheus' attempt to improve the human condition by arranging that men get the better part of the sacrifice, in return for which Zeus hid both livelihood (making agriculture necessary), and fire; Prometheus then stole fire, and in return for that Zeus created Pandora, another evil.

We do not find in the Near East a clear statement of the "Four Ages of Man": there are parallels in ancient Iranian (Zoroastrian) traditions

²¹ For the Indo-European approach, see Wikander (1952); Briquel (1980); Allen (2004). Wikander drew attention to a succession of three mortal Persian rulers (Jamshid, Zohak, Feridun). Littleton (1970) and Puhvel (1987) 31 disagree with this on the grounds that it is not well enough attested in the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European. The dragon-slaying myth may have an Indo-European dimension: see Littleton (1970); West (2007) 257. Janda (2001) argues for Indo-European elements in the myth of Ullikummi, pointing out, for example, that the word *maldani*, to which the growing Ullikummi is likened, may mean "hammer" (Puhvel s.v. but not CHD), which might provide a link to Thor's hammer in Norse mythology.

²² For the relationship between divine history and human history in Near Eastern poetry, see Haubold (2002).

²³ Sourvinou-Inwood (1997).

and also in early Indian mythology, but these are not necessarily earlier than Hesiod.²⁴ The themes of Pandora and Prometheus are also rather difficult to parallel in the Near East,²⁵ although Fred Naiden has recently drawn attention to a parallel for the idea of “concealing livelihood” in the Old Babylonian version of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* where the alewife advises the hero: when the gods created mankind they allotted death to mankind. They kept life (*balatum*) in their own hands.²⁶

Ludwig Koenen has pointed to broad general parallels with Egyptian and Near Eastern literature in the area of the periodization; specifically:

- a. the idea that the present age is bad, and/or the future may be worse, attested strikingly in Egyptian *Prophecy of Nefertiti* (early 2nd millennium BC) and the *Admonitions of Ipuwar* (14th century BC or older).²⁷ The tone of the latter is particularly reminiscent of Hesiod’s Iron Age (4):

Lo, great and small say “I wish I were dead”
Little children say “He should not have made me live”.

- b. the idea of a golden age where gods and men lived together in harmony followed by a crisis where they are separated. Koenen finds this pattern in the Egyptian “Myth of the Heavenly Cow”, where the initial period is brought to an end by a rebellion of mankind; Re then sends Sekhmet to destroy mankind, but ultimately a resolution is produced.²⁸
- c. the idea of a gradual decline in the relations between god and man over period of time, as in the *Atrahasis Epic*, where men are created by the gods to do the work that was originally done by the lesser gods, but subsequently Enlil decided to destroy them because he could not stand the noise they made. His initial attempts failed, because men were aided by Enki, but eventually he succeeded by

²⁴ West (1997) 31; from Reitzenstein (1924–1925). For the Iranian tradition, see Boyce (1991) 385.

²⁵ West (1997) 120; Pandora’s jar: Haas (1976) 199–200 and *id.* (1994) 911; first, I think, in Hoffner (1968) 66, who points to the additional parallel in the Hebrew prophet Zechariah ch. 5.5–11. For Prometheus, see below.

²⁶ Naiden (2003). Text in George (2003) 1.278–279 (iii.5).

²⁷ *Prophecy of Nefertiti*: AEL 1, 139–145; *Admonitions of Ipuwar*: AEL 1, 149–162; Cf. also the Akkadian “Shulgi’s” prophecy: BTM 357–359.

²⁸ Koenen (1994) 17; the text in Hornung (1982), esp. 90–94; translation: LOAE 290–298; cf. AEL 2, 198–199; on the Egyptian golden age, Otto (1969); cf. Meek and Favard-Meeks (1997) 25–26.

sending the flood, which only Atrahasis survived.²⁹ Interestingly, the *Atrahasis* Epic is believed independently to have influenced early the Greek poetic tradition.³⁰

- d. the idea that at one point in history the earth was dominated by demigods fathered by gods on mortal women. Koenen finds this theme both in the Hebrew Bible (*Gen.* 6.1–4) and in the Apocrypha where the “Sons of God” (fallen angels?) mate with women, producing a race of giants, which is then wiped out by Yahweh in the Flood,³¹ and he postulates an earlier Near Eastern background. Koenen thinks that in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* the idea that the end of the heroic age and the onset of the present age happened with the death of demigod heroes and the transferal of some of them to the Isles of the Blest represents a sort of contamination with the other Near Eastern traditions of two ages of the world, the present one and the past one in which the gods walked amongst men.
- e. One could perhaps also add the parallel between the creation of Eve and the creation of Pandora in the Hebrew Bible and Hesiod. Eve, unlike Pandora, is not created as an evil, but her role in the story is to catalyse the Fall of Man by allowing herself to be seduced by the snake.

For Koenen, Hesiod’s four ages represent an adaptation of these models. The fact that the sequence of metals is broken in Hesiod indicates that that sequence predates him, but it is likely to emanate from the period after iron became less valuable than other metals, which would be well into the archaeological “Iron Age”. Another difference drawn attention to by Koenen is that in the Near East and Egypt the idea of cultural decline is usually explicitly or implicitly a foil for the theme of a reversion to order, under the leadership of a just ruler, of which there is no sign in Hesiod. These themes are, so to speak, disembedded from their original ritual/political context.³²

²⁹ Haas (2006).

³⁰ Burkert (1992).

³¹ *Genesis* 6.1–4; *Jubilees* 5.1–19 (translation of *Jubilees* is to be found in Charles 1913: vol. 2, 11–82); Joseph, *Ant.* 1.73–74; Hendel (2003) 30–32; Bremmer (2003) suggests a derivation of these from the Hesiodic Titans.

³² Koenen (1994).

1.2.3. Didactic Literature

The prescriptive sections of the *Works and Days* have extensive parallels with the rich didactic literature of the Near Eastern and Egypt.³³ In Egypt didactic literature is attested from the Old Kingdom (3rd millennium BC) until the Hellenistic period, and includes:³⁴ the *Maxims of Ptahhotep* (Old Kingdom); the *Eloquent Peasant* (Middle Kingdom); the *Instructions of Ipuwar* (New Kingdom); the *Instructions of Amenemope* (Ramessid 13th century BC); and the *Instructions of 'Onchsheshonqy* (attested only in Demotic, 1st millennium BC).³⁵ Key examples from the Near East include the *Sumerian Instructions of Suruppag* (18th century BC); the *Sumerian Agricultural Handbook*; the *Counsels of Wisdom* (second half of 2nd millennium?); and the *Book of Ahiqar* (5th century BC, purporting to date from the period of Sennacherib).³⁶ Fragments of proverb collections, some of them bilingual, have been found at Ugarit and at the Hittite capital at Hattusa.³⁷

Peter Walcot and Martin West have drawn attention to a wide range of parallels between this material and Eastern wisdom literature, including proverbs and precepts, animal fables (e.g. in the recently published Hittite-Hurrian *Epic of Liberation*), the theme of the justice of the king, and hemerology.³⁸ Some of the parallels are very striking, for example warning against injustice in dividing up inheritances found in *Maxims of Ptahhotep* c. 20, which is comparable to the general theme of the *Works and Days*:

Do not be selfish with the division (of an estate)
But lusting for more than your rightful share
Do not be selfish with respect to your relatives ...

³³ Walcot (1965); West (1997) 76–78.

³⁴ See Lichtheim (1996).

³⁵ *Maxims of Ptahhotep*: AEL 1, 61 ff.; LOAE, 129 ff.; the *Eloquent Peasant*: AEL 1, 169–183, LOAE 25 ff.; the *Instructions of Ipuwar*: AEL 1, 149–163; the *Instructions of Amenemope*, Ramessid: AEL 2, 146 ff., LOAE 223 ff.; the *Instructions of 'Onksheshonqy*: AEL 3, 159–183; LAOE 497 ff.

³⁶ The *Instructions of Suruppag*: BWL 92 ff.; Black–Cunningham–Robson–Zólyomi (2004) 284–292 (<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.5.6.1#>); the *Counsels of Wisdom*: BWL, 96 ff.; the *Sumerian Agricultural Handbook*: Salonen (1968); Civil (1994); <http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.5.6.3#>; the *Book of Ahiqar*: introduction and translation in Charles (1913) vol. 2, 714–715; relation between Ahiqar and Greek literature: Luzzato (1992) and *id.* (1994).

³⁷ Beckman (1986) 20 n. 6.

³⁸ Fables: West (1997) 319–320; justice of the king: West (1997) 320 ff.; hemerology: West (1997) 328 ff.

Even more striking is the warning against unjust gain in the *Instructions of Amenemope* which finds an exact parallel with *Works and Days* 298 ff. and 320 ff.:³⁹

Plow your fields and you'll receive what you need,
You'll receive bread from the threshing floor.
Better is a bushel given you by the god
Than five thousand through wrongdoing.

It has also been pointed out that the frames of some of these works exhibit similarities to the frame of the *Works and Days*. Thus in the Aramaic *Ahiqar*, a work which came to have a wide influence on the literature of the Mediterranean, the eponymous wise man is represented as having been betrayed by the nephew he advanced.⁴⁰ In the Demotic wisdom text that bears his name, 'Onchsheshonqy was imprisoned because he failed to communicate to the Pharaoh a plot against him, a plot which (interestingly, in view of the *Works and Days*), involved one brother acting against another. Both of these in their attested form are later than Hesiod, and it has been suggested that 'Onchsheshonqy in particular was influenced by Hesiod rather than the other way round.⁴¹ Much earlier, but slightly different, is the frame of the *Eloquent Peasant*, in which the eponymous peasant having been wronged by an unscrupulous official who blocks his right of way, makes a long and eloquent complaint (in a total of nine petitions) and ultimately wins (admittedly, in this case the content of the complaint is not proverbs or wisdom literature).⁴² At any rate, the example of *Ahiqar* proves that this type of frame was around, and it might well have influenced Greek didactic literature, such as Hesiod's *Works and Days*, and also the Aesop tradition.

The frame of the *Theogony*—inspired shepherd reveals order of the universe—does not have such an impressive Near Eastern background, but one can at least point to the prophets in the Hebrew Bible who find revelation in the wilderness, especially the prophetic *Words of Amos* (*dibārê 'āmwōs*).⁴³ The content of Amos' prophecies shares key themes

³⁹ Walcot (1966) 87; AEL 2, 147–163; passage cited here is c. 6.17 ff., p. 152.

⁴⁰ Charles (1913) vol. 2, 11–18; Conybeare–Harris–Lewis (1898); for the tradition, Cottini and Grotanelli (2005).

⁴¹ Walcot (1962a); similar patterns of Greek influence on Demotic Egyptian literature have since been identified by many authors.

⁴² West (1978) 28.

⁴³ See Seybold and von Ungern-Sternberg (1993); Andrews (1943); West (1997) 307 and *id.* (1966) 159. The parallel between Hesiod and Amos seems first to have been observed by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

with the Hesiod of the *Works and Days*, namely a concern with the immoral behaviour of the present generation of men, and the ill-treatment of people of his own class; consider for example, *Amos* 5, 7–11, where the prophet rails against: "... You that turn justice upside down / And bring righteousness to the ground / You that hate a man who brings the wrongdoer to court / And loathe him who speaks the whole truth ...". Unlike Amos, though, Hesiod makes no promises about the gods' imminent punishment of mankind. It has been suggested that Hesiod and Amos each presuppose a common type of social crisis in their own country, where the interests of agricultural and farming society came into conflict with those of the developing city-state.⁴⁴

1.3. *What parallels mean*

The large number of parallels would be compatible with either of three general hypotheses:

- i. there was a cultural *koine* in this region, i.e. a process of mutual borrowing or diffusion at a much earlier period (perhaps the Early Bronze Age) had led to the establishment by the Late Bronze Age of a common culture. A common pattern of diffusion is most likely to have gone from the old centres of Mesopotamia to the periphery of Anatolia and the Aegean, but there will have been other patterns as well, such as that associated with the Indo-Europeans.
- ii. it could be argued that many of these parallels are reflections of underlying similarities in the political and social structures of the cultures in question. Thus the similarities between Hesiod and Amos could be explained by the hypothesis that both are symptoms of analogous crises in their respective societies. In that case, the proper object of investigation would be not how literary and religious ideas pass from one culture to another, but broad patterns of transmission and diffusion of political and economic structures.⁴⁵
- iii. transmission of literary forms, narratives or motifs did indeed take place between one culture to another.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Kaiser (1969); Seybold and von Ungern-Sternberg (1993) 237–239.

⁴⁵ Cf. recently Leroux (2007) 138 on astrometeorological traditions as independent developments.

⁴⁶ On theoretical issues related to borrowing, see Bernabé (1995) and Mondi (1990) ("conceptual foci").

The problem with option iii) is that any individual case is very hard to prove. It is important to remember that the surviving evidence comprises only part of the literary and cultural production of a few societies. Many cultures that had oral poetry probably never recorded it in writing. Surviving evidence creates the impression that Near Eastern and Egyptian literature have priority in all cases, but this may be an illusion. A further problem is that we cannot be sure that borrowing always goes from the East to the Aegean: in some cases, it has been suspected that the route went in the other direction.⁴⁷

A special problem is caused by a number of cases where parallels to Greek religion and literature are found in both the Near East or Egypt and also in Indo-European cultures, such as early India. Symptomatic is the fact that Martin West diagnoses some of the same things as Near Eastern in his 1997 book and Indo-European in his 2007 book.⁴⁸ Some key example are:

- a. the distinction between older and newer generations of gods: we have seen that this is attested for the Near East; and there are also traces of it in the Vedic Indian myth that the Asuras were defeated by the gods.⁴⁹
- b. the theme of the decline of civilisation and the end of the present era, which Koenen has tried to derive from the Near East, but which is also attested in Indo-European cultures, for example in the *Mahabharata*.⁵⁰ The theme might have started out in the Near East and subsequently spread to the East as well as the West, but there are many other possibilities. Similarly, the theme of the Four Ages of Man, which is attested in Greece, Iran and India, could be thought of as a poorly attested Near Eastern theme, which survives only through its diffusion, or as Indo-European theme.
- c. The theme of “justice of kings” in the *Works and Days*, which West (1997) claims as Near Eastern, but it could also be Indo-European, as he argues in West (2007).⁵¹

⁴⁷ Walcot (1962a) on ‘*Onsheshonqy*’; Titans in the *Apocrypha*: Stuckenbruck (2003) 109–110 (on binding of Titans 713–721); Pearson (1999) 38–41; the Four Races from Hesiod to Zoroastrianism: see above.

⁴⁸ West (2007) 23 himself realises the problem.

⁴⁹ West (2007) 162–164.

⁵⁰ Indo-European aspects: Kilmer (1972); O’Brien (1976) 317; cf. article “eschatology” in Mallory and Adams (1997) 180–183.

⁵¹ West (2007) 420–424; see also Martin (1984).

- d. Slightly different is the case of Prometheus. Stephanie West showed in a very persuasive article that the Prometheus of Aeschylus has various features in common with the Babylonian wisdom god Ea, especially in the motif of warning men about the imminent flood, but that this Near Eastern colouring was absent in Hesiod. Martin West ([1997] 295) admits that the Hesiodic Prometheus “shows no features that we can definitely relate to the Babylonian god”, but he includes a section on “The Prometheus Myth” in the *Works and Days* (pp. 310–312) which contains the following claims: i. the theme that the gods have imposed agriculture on mankind is found in Near Eastern sources; ii. the conversation between Zeus and Prometheus (“You rejoice at having outwitted me, but I shall create a greater calamity for man”) resembles the conversation between Anu and Kumarbi in KIHC (do not rejoice at having swallowed my manhood; you are now pregnant); and iii. certain Near Eastern traits in the Pandora story, e.g. the idea that Hermes gave Pandora lies and deceit is paralleled in the creation of man in the “Babylonian Theodicy”.⁵² None of these points has anything to do with Prometheus himself, and we have to face the fact that Hesiod’s Prometheus has no obvious Near Eastern or Egyptian parallel. On the other hand, there are striking parallels with early Indian mythology, and even the name of Prometheus has been traced to an Indo-European root.⁵³ And then again, many scholars have compared Prometheus to a type of figure attested neither in the Near East nor in ancient India, but attested in the mythologies of Africa and the Pacific, namely the “culture hero” or “trickster” figure.⁵⁴

None of these cases (a-d) can be confidently claimed as instances of borrowing from the Near Eastern sources, and they are just as likely to be the result of a more general cultural diffusion and some of them may not be the result of borrowing at all.

It follows that if we want to prove that early Greek literature has been influenced by the Near East, we need to set the bar quite high: vague resemblances of form (literary or lexical) or content are not enough; and

⁵² BWL 88. Another Near Eastern creation of man: Mayer (1987); see in general Pettinato (1971).

⁵³ West (2007).

⁵⁴ Dougherty-Glenn (2006) 33 citing Ricketts (1965).

it will tend to decrease the chances of borrowing of the feature if it is broadly attested in ancient societies outside the Near East.

Of the three areas I discussed in this section, the material relating to “Eras of Human History” seems to me too widely attested in ancient societies for us to be sure that it came to Greece from the Near East, and it might be better to put this down to a general and very ancient diffusion. Similarly, the material I grouped under “didactic literature” is not specific enough for us to be sure that Hesiod or his predecessors drew on specific written or oral works of Near Eastern or Egyptian literature, and it seems possible that we could explain much of this as parallel responses to similar political and social substrata. The only case where we have a strong reason to posit borrowing is the one between the *Theogony* and the KIHC, to which I turn in the next section.

2

The relationship between KIHC and Hesiod’s *Theogony* has been discussed many times already, and it seems unnecessary to go through it again here. A few key issues need to be addressed, however.

2.1. *Scope and Epic Nature of KIHC*

2.1.1. An Outline of the KIHC

The unifying feature in these songs is conflict between the storm-god Tessub and grain-god Kumarbi. The *Song of Kumarbi* describes Kumarbi’s emasculation of the sky-god Anu and resulting birth from inside Kumarbi of Tessub and several other gods. The lost part of the Song written on tablet II and any subsequent tablets must have described how Tessub established his rule (corresponding, perhaps, to Zeus battle against the Titans in the *Theogony*). Other songs described challenges to Tessub’s rule brought by several other monsters and other figures, some of them clearly created as “rivals” (*tarpanalli’s*) by Kumarbi.⁵⁵ The most important of

⁵⁵ The word *tarpanalli* (“rival”) is related to, or identical to, the word *tarpalli* which occurs in Hittite rituals in the sense of “ritual substitute” corresponding to Akkadian PUHU, Hurrian puhugari; HEG s.v. This is, in fact, part of the Babylonian notion of “ritual substitution”, something which does not exist in the Greek world (Gurney [1977] 52–57). The word *tarpalli* became known to classicists because of the suggestion of Van Brock (1959) that it underlies the use of θεράπων in Homer, a suggestion popularised in Nagy

these is the *Song of Ullikummi*, which describes at almost epic length the birth of the stone monster Ullikummi (made of *kunkunuzzi* stone, like the stone that Kumarbi spits out in the *Song of Kumarbi*), his challenge to the divine order, and the gods' defeat of him by cutting his feet from the ground with a primeval copper "cutting tool", the same one that was supposed to have been used in primeval times to separate earth from heaven (just as Kronos' scythe separates Ouranos from Gaia).

In the *Song of Ullikummi* the goddess Sauska (the Hurrian Ishtar) contemplates seducing the monster with music, but is advised against it by an ocean wave, which points out that Ullikummi is blind and deaf. This passage probably alludes to an earlier passage in another song, which described how Sauska successfully charmed the sea monster Hedammu, another of Kumarbi's creations. Nothing proves that these three songs are part of one song-cycle, but modern scholars have been tempted to see it this way, with a continuous development of certain themes; for example, Harry Hoffner has claimed that over the course of the cycle the god Ea, who was initially not specially well disposed towards Tessub, ends up assisting him in the war against Ullikummi.⁵⁶

Several other songs have also been assigned to the sequence. The very fragmentary *Song of Silver* consists of mysterious narrative about a divinity called "Silver", apparently a son of Kumarbi, though raised as an orphan. The proem claims that "Silver" is greater than any other god in the pantheon. In the so-called *Song of LAMMA*, the protagonist is the deity known by the sumerograms ³LAMMA or ³KAL, probably to be identified with the deer-god Kurunta. In col. i of this song LAMMA defeats Tessub, and becomes king, apparently for nine years;⁵⁷ in col. ii that seems to result in a sort of Golden Age in which the land flowed with beer-wine and other desirable drinks; in col. iii LAMMA explains to Kubaba that he does not respect the elder gods:

The primeval gods are great. The w[inds] have arisen. But [I do not fear] them at all. [Do I] not [put] bread in their mouths? The paths which the winds] are to go and come on, these I, LAMMA, king of heaven, allot to the gods.

The result of this policy is that men no longer offer sacrifices; and Ea (and perhaps Kumarbi as well) decide to depose him. Finally, in col. iv after his defeat LAMMA's body is divided up by the other gods, perhaps a

(1979). Soysal (2004) 105 n. 12 suggests that *tarpanalli* ("opponent, rival") and *tarpalli* ("substitute") are in fact different words.

⁵⁶ Hoffner (1998).

⁵⁷ Blam (2005).

sort of primeval sacrifice.⁵⁸ The apparent reference to the Golden Age reminds Hellenists of the myth of the Four Ages in the *Works and Days*, though as far as we can see it is not the original state of things in the Hittite text but an episode that takes place during Tessub's reign. If LAMMA is another *tarpanalli* of Kumarbi, this would create an interesting analogy to the association between Kronos and the Golden Age in Hesiod.⁵⁹

2.1.2. New Discoveries

There have been two very recent additions to the sequence. The first is the *Song of the Sea*, preserved only in Hurrian, which apparently described the triumph of the storm god over the Sea.⁶⁰ Two aspects of it are important:

- i. The theme bears a striking similarity to the Ugaritic epic of Baal and Yamm.⁶¹ One of them may well have been the model for the other, but which? (the same issue arises for the pivotal position of Mount Hazzi in the *Song of Ullikummi*, since that was also a sacred mountain in West semitic religion).
- ii. While we know very little about how these songs were performed,⁶² there is some reason to think that they were performed in rituals. Hittite ritual texts relating to the cult of Mount Hazzi refer to the performance of the *Song of the Sea* and the *Song of Kingship* (where "kingship" is the Hurrian word "*sarasse*"). It is a tempting idea that the *Song of Kingship* may be the Hittite name for the *Song of Kumarbi*, or even the whole cycle.⁶³ If the Hurro-Hittite KHC had such a politico-religious function, they would arguably be continuing the practice of the Babylonians who scheduled the *Enuma Elish* for performance at the New Year festival at Babylon.⁶⁴

⁵⁸ Haas (2003), Haas (2006) 145 sees Kurunta as a sort of dying-god of the Near Eastern type, or in Hellenic terms something like Dionysus.

⁵⁹ The ritual correlate of Kronos association with the Golden Age is his association with festivals of reversal, and these are well attested for the Near East: see Burkert (1993).

⁶⁰ Rutherford (2001); Salvini and Wegner (2004) 21; Haas (2006).

⁶¹ See Parker (1997). Another myth that belongs in the same group of the Egyptian legend of Astarte and the Tribute of the Sea (COS 1, 35–36), which has been claimed to be influenced by the Hurrian *Song of Ullikummi* (Helck 1983).

⁶² On song in Hittite culture in general, see now Schul (2004).

⁶³ KUB 44.7, obv. 11 and KBo 8.88, obv. 8 f. (Haas–Wilhelm: 1974, 260 ff.); see Rutherford (2001).

⁶⁴ Auffarth (1991).

The other new discovery is the fragmentary text *Ea and the Beast*, in which an animal of an unknown type (referred to as a “*suppala(nt-)*” animal) prophesies to Ea the coming triumph of a still unnamed weather god, described apparently as a *tarpala* (col. 2.23), which seems to be the same word as *tarpanalli*.⁶⁵ It is unclear whether the deity referred to here is Tessub, which would make the narrative a doublet of the *Song of Kumarbi*, or another weather-god (in which case the Beast’s prophetic knowledge would presumably have to turn out to be thwarted in some way). It is surely significant that similar prophecies are found in Hesiod and other Greek sources: in Hesiod, the prophecies comes from Gaia and Ouranos who advise Kronos to swallow his children (463–465), and Zeus to swallow Metis (889–900).⁶⁶ The swallowing of Metis seems to be a doublet of Kronos’ swallowing of his children, and the ensuing birth of Athena seems to incorporate the “birth through the head” motif from Kumarbi.⁶⁷

2.1.3. Nature of the Songs

Comparatively little of the Hurrian originals of the songs survives, and what does is difficult to understand, though Hurrian is now clearer than it was thanks to the publication of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual of the *Epic of Liberation* in 1996.⁶⁸ One of the few passages of KIHC where we have the Hurrian original is the episode where Kumarbi places the young (and still nameless) Ullikummi on his knee, and names him as the future destroyer of Tessub’s seat in the city of Kumme.⁶⁹

tiie=i=a Ull=i-Kummi=[n Let his name be Ullikummi

Kumme=n=i=m ull=o=l=ez And let Kumme be destroyed

For the most part we rely on the Hittite adaptations, many of which are poorly preserved, presenting to editors similar problems to those classicists find in editing fragmentary literary papyri. A good example

⁶⁵ Archi (2002); see Rutherford (forthcoming).

⁶⁶ The detail of the birth of the subsequent Athene through his head is not in the *Theogony*, though it is found in a Hesiodic fragment (fr. 343) from Chrysippus.

⁶⁷ West (1966) 401. So in Pindar Zeus does not marry Thetis because of a prophecy: *Isthm.* 8.30–45; Gantz (1996) 52, although in the *Cypria* Thetis declines the union out of fear of Hera.

⁶⁸ Neu (1996). For the Hurrian texts, see Salvini and Wegner (2004) n. 8–18 with pp. 17–22. Specific texts: Giorgieri (2001) and Dijkstra (2006). For the Hurrian language, Wegner (2000).

⁶⁹ Giorgieri (2001) 144–145.

is the passage in col. ii of the *Song of Kumarbi*, where the gods are born from Kumarbi's body, and Kumarbi seems to announce that he desires to eat the Storm-god. This section shows a particularly dense assemblage of parallels with the *Theogony*. Unfortunately, the text is poorly preserved, and, to make it worse, there is uncertainty about which gods are involved: first, a deity called A.GILIM speaks from inside Kumarbi's body, then another deity called KA.ZAL emerges from his skull. Volkert Haas takes both of these names as epithets of Tessub, so that the whole passage describes the birth of Tessub, who is not called "Tessub" until the moment of his birth, but it is impossible to be certain.⁷⁰

One of the features that stands out is the considerable scale of the songs. The well-preserved *Song of Ullikummi* was written in three tablets, which must have comprised about 600 lines of text in all. The others were probably of a similar length. In fact, the general tone of KIHC seems epic to someone familiar with Greek poetry. There are regularly repeated formulas and themes, as we have come to expect from orally composed poetry.⁷¹ Furthermore, the scale is decidedly epic. Thus, when Ullikummi is on the rampage, the KIHC does not merely state the fact that Tessub has been defeated, but describes its affect on his wife Hebat (44–47):

... she almost fell down from the roof. Had she taken a step, she would have fallen down from the roof. But her female attendants seized her and didn't let go of her.

Students of Greek literature are reminded perhaps of Andromache watching the Greek forces in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 6.371–373).

2.1.4. Trans-cultural status

Like a few other works of Near Eastern literature, KIHC seems to have transcended the confines of any one culture. Its transition from Hurrian culture to the Hittites was not a process of translation, but rather one of adaptation, perhaps the result of oral performances in Hittite based on the Hurrian models (cf. Archi [2007]). There are parallels also in West-Semitic (Ugaritic and Phoenician) mythology, as I showed in 1.2.1A, and these are probably to be explained as influence of Hurrian mythology on West-Semitic culture, although it is possible that there was also some

⁷⁰ Haas (2006) 138. A.GILIM may also be taken as the Babylonian god Marduk (Pecchioli-Daddi and Polvani 1990: 120), and KA.ZAL has been taken as Ishtar.

⁷¹ Haas (2006); Archi (2007).

influence in the other direction, at least at an early stage. As we saw, the Phoenician tradition differs in one crucial respect, namely that it has a single line of descent, as opposed to the two lines of the Hurrian version.

The supraregional quality of KIHC may be a much older feature: the Hurrians, who in the Late Bronze Age inhabited the state of Mitanni in North Syria, seem to have migrated from further East, possibly the area of Lake Van. Although their language is non-Indo-European, some divine names, proper names and technical terms seem to be of Indo-European origin, which, it is suggested, might be the remnant of contact with Indo-Iranians to the East.⁷² We have already considered the possibility that the KIHC might contain a deeper thematic Indo-European stratum.

We also have to take account of the fact that by the Late Bronze Age Hurrian culture had absorbed religious ideas and practices and literary forms from the ancient civilisations of Syria and Mesopotamia.⁷³ As we saw, it is also possible that there has been some interaction with West Semitic mythology as well. Geoffrey Kirk in his study *Greek Myths* postulates a “pre-Hurrian koine” version of the KIHC, from which both the Hurrian and the Greek versions would be secondary developments; this would presumably be North Syrian and related to West Semitic sources.⁷⁴

2.2. *The KIHC and Hesiod*

2.2.1. Similarities and Differences

I set out the principal similarities between the *Theogony* and KIHC in 1.2.1. Some of them are general features that we might expect to show up in any succession narrative, but others are much more specific, particularly the role of the stone which ends up with a cult function in both traditions. We may also add now that the theme of a prophecy about the imminent arrival of a new supreme god is part of both traditions. There are also significant differences between the two traditions, and I would single out three principal ones:

⁷² Wilhelm (1989) 18.

⁷³ Cf. 1.2.1A above.

⁷⁴ Kirk (1970) 219, citing Fontenrose (1959) 212 for the view that “the Hurrian version resembles an earlier and cruder version of the Greek myth”. So Wilhelm (1989) 58 for the suggestion that the Hurrian KIHC was originally in Akkadian.

- a. Lines of descent. Hesiod's royal family has a single line of descent: Ouranos-Kronos-Zeus; in KIHC there are two lines, although they come together in the "marriage of Anu and Tessub" (see below). The Phoenician mythological tradition, as reported in Philo of Byblos, is a better parallel in this respect.
- b. Pregnant Gods. Hesiod Zeus' siblings are the children of Kronos and Rhea, and Kronos' swallowing of them and subsequent disgorgement, though it could be seen as a sort of perverted second birth, is really just a convenient way of holding back the next generation (analogous to Ouranos keeping his offspring hidden in Gaia). In the KIHC, on the other hand, Kumarbi takes on the role of Anu's wife and the mother of Tessub and his siblings (he is invoked as Tessub's mother in an extant Hurrian hymn).⁷⁵ For Kumarbi his act of emasculating Anu is also an act of copulation, and for Tessub and his siblings, their exit from Kumarbi's body is their real birth, not a secondary birth as in the corresponding section of Hesiod. Thus, both Hesiod and KIHC represent a sort of perverted version of the pregnancy and birth, but they do so in different ways: Hesiod has Kronos repress the development of his children by subjecting them to a forced second pregnancy; Kumarbi is himself forced to take on the role of mother to Anu's children.⁷⁶
- c. Zeus temporally defeated. Hesiod's accounts of Zeus' wars against challengers to his authority—the Titans and Typhon—are brief in comparison to the long Hurro-Hittite narratives of Tessub's conflicts with the various *tarpanalli's* Kumarbi throws at him. In particular, Zeus never shows signs of having to give up his royal authority, whereas Tessub loses his several times.

Two more contrasts may be added:

- d. Alternation rather than succession? In KIHC there may be a regular temporal or ritual structure in the background in which Tessub yields to a sequence of challengers for a sort of interregnum, so that the pattern would be not one of succession at all, but rather

⁷⁵ See above.

⁷⁶ Kirk (1970) 215–219 on gender aspects. Jacobsen (1984) 19–20: "it ignores completely the marriage-cosmogonic aspect of the tale, omitting all references to marriage and wives, and to any father-son relationship between the successive contenders for cosmic rule".

one of alternation between Tessub and the forces of disorder.⁷⁷ In the case of LAMMA the *interregnum* seems to have lasted nine years—the same period as the reign of each of Anu and Alalu had lasted. As Alberto Bernabé suggested twenty years ago, the successive nine-year rules of Anu and Alalu seem to resemble an alternation between two cosmic forces rather than a linear succession, and that would be another difference from Hesiod.⁷⁸

- e. Rituals of kingship? The Babylonian *Enuma Elish* seems to have had a ritual function, performed to inaugurate the new year, and we saw that the performance of the KIHC may have been linked to Hurrian rituals of royal authority. The theme of divine succession could then be thought of as reflecting on an imaginary level the political reality of ritualized kingship in the Near East.⁷⁹ We do not know how the *Theogony* was performed, but it certainly contains no sign that it was performed in such a context. Kings are part of the frame of the *Works and Days*, of course, but there too we lack the sense of a single royal authority; and we saw earlier that whereas in Near Eastern sources, the theme of the decline of human civilisation seems generally to be a foil for the idea of the imminent emergence of a new ruler destined to restore civilization to its pristine condition, that element is absent from Hesiod's account of the four races (cf. 1.2.2).⁸⁰

2.2.2. Parallels between KIHC and the Greek Succession Myth Outside Hesiod

These differences become less clearly demarcated if we take into account the whole of Greek mythology rather than just Hesiod's *Theogony*. For example, in the case of point e., notice that an association between the kingship-in-heaven theme and the rituals of kingship cannot be

⁷⁷ Blam (2005); Bernabé (1989) NB: in rituals of kingship the king is replaced by a *tarpalli*, and that structure seems to be dimly reflected in the myths of the *tarpanallis* to divine authority; both *tarpalli* and *tarpanalli* replace the king, but whereas the *tarpalli* replaces him to shield him as a sort of body-double the *tarpanalli* aims to replace by way of usurping power from him; the *tarpanalli*'s relation to Kumarbi is in fact perhaps closer to the ritual role of *tarpalli* as a double who works on behalf of the agent.

⁷⁸ Haas (1994) 85–86 tried to connect these nine year periods with calendrical structures from the Near East with the main periods representing stages of the year, though it's unclear whether that's right. Speculation on calendrical implications in Haas (1994).

⁷⁹ Hooke (1960), Frankfort (1948).

⁸⁰ Koenen (1994).

excluded for the whole Greek poetic tradition, since Pindar associates Zeus' conquest over Typhon with Hieron's founding of the city of Aitna.⁸¹

As for the idea of Kumarbi's oral coupling with Anu and his pregnancy, there seems to be a parallel for this in the Orphic cosmogony reported in the Derveni Papyrus. In this the earliest stage is the generation of a demiurge figure called Phanes or Protogonos, also called Eros, who engenders a whole family of gods: Ouranos, then Kronos, and finally Zeus. Zeus, once king, swallows Protogonos/Phanes, so that "everything is reunited within him" (West [1982] 73), and then he brings it all forth again, and so becomes the second creator. In the course of the cosmogony Zeus swallows something called (an) αἰδοῖον (fr. 8 Bernabé), which many commentators have taken as the *phallos* of Ouranos. This motif obviously resembles the behaviour of Kumarbi in KIHC, although Ouranos is also castrated by Kronos, so the motif is doubled and split between generations.⁸² The composition of the Derveni poem is now usually placed in the 6th century BC, but that does not mean the motif of divine fellation was already established in Greece before then.

In the case of point c., notice that other versions of the Typhon myth in Greek mythology represent Zeus and the gods as having been temporarily defeated by Typhon. Apollodorus the mythographer (*Bibl.* 1.6.3) reports that Typhon stole the sinews of Zeus and hid them in a bear-skin, giving them to the she-dragon Delphyne to guard at Corycus in Cilicia; but Hermes and Aigipan restored them to Zeus. The combat took place at Mt. Kasion, precisely the point from where the gods observed Ullikummi in the KIHC.⁸³ Oppian, *Halieutica* 3.15–28 says that Pan of Corycus in Cilicia saved Zeus by tricking Typhon with a banquet of fish. Cilicia is already associated with Typhon by Pindar and Aeschylus.⁸⁴ And according to Nonnus, *Dion.* 1.481 ff. Kadmos retrieved the sinews, claiming he would use them to string his lyre. Kadmos' charming of the Typhon seems to replicate Sauska's role as a charmer of Hedammu.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Dealt with in Trümpf (1958).

⁸² Relevant bibliography: Lopez-Ruiz (2006); Bernabé (1989); Betegh (2004) 119–120 170–172; Burkert (2005) 90–92; West (1982) had interpreted *aidoion* in a different way.

⁸³ See Koch 1993.

⁸⁴ Pindar, *Pyth.* 1.19; Aesch. *PV* 351.

⁸⁵ Silván Rodríguez (2002) 151 n. 10. For another Anatolian echo in Nonnus see Bernabé (1988), who suggests that Nonnus might have used the epic poet Nestor of Laranda. It has also been noticed that Nonnos' description of Typhon standing in the sea (Nonnos 1.266–268) is eerily close to the description of Ullikummi in KIHC (§ 22 Aiv 27–32; Güterbock [1946] 104–105; Littleton [1970] 92). And a scholion on Homer reports

The idea of the storm-god being temporarily defeated by the monster also has a parallel in the myth of the serpent Illuyankas, known as the “Hattic” stratum of central Anatolia, and associated with the new-year “purulli” festival there.⁸⁶ In the first of the two versions of the myth that are known, the goddess Inara and a mortal Hupasiya trick the serpent into getting drunk at a feast where the Storm-god kills him (cf. Oppian’s account, or the role of the mortal Kadmos in Nonnos); in the second version, the Storm-god is initially defeated by Illuyankas, losing his heart and eyes, but eventually gets them back with the help of his son (cf. the sinews in Apollodorus).⁸⁷

It is thus clear, then, that the story of divine succession existed in variant forms in Greek tradition, as indeed it existed in variant forms in Anatolian and West Semitic traditions. It follows that it is exceedingly difficult to plot the relationship between Greek versions and Near Eastern versions beyond the bland statement that the process of borrowing between these zones was most likely not confined to one version alone, but probably extended to a number of variants, and may have taken place in several stages over many centuries.

2.2.3. How KIHC came to Greece

The problem of the relationship between KIHC and Hesiod thus comes down to three issues: a. what version/versions of the myth was/were transmitted from the Near East to Greece; b. how did transmission come about? What route did it follow and when and who was responsible? And c. what role in the process did Hesiod play?

To start with issue b., various directions of diffusion are possible:⁸⁸

- i. Through Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age, perhaps passing to Western Anatolia and through centres such as Ephesos (Hittite Apasa) and Miletus (Hittite Millawanda); that route would be less likely after the Hittite kingdom collapses at the start of the 12th century BC. Factors that point faintly in that direction are: the tradition

that Typhon was the offspring of Kronos, the product of one of two eggs, buried in Cilicia (sch. on *Il.* B 783; ed. Dindorf III S. 148 f.; Güterbock [1946] 104; Gantz [1996] 50–51).

⁸⁶ Watkins (1995) 448–459; Katz (1998) connects the name with Latin “anguilla” = eel.

⁸⁷ Hoffner (1998) 11–13.

⁸⁸ West (1997) 626–627 on the route.

of the stone-monster Agdistis at Pessinous, which has been linked to Ullikummi;⁸⁹ the presence in later Greek accounts about Typhon of two motifs—Typhon’s being deceived by an invitation to a feast and Zeus temporarily losing his “sinews”—seems to be paralleled by the central Anatolian Hattic myth of Illuyanka;⁹⁰ and the association of Typhon with the Katakekaumene area of Lydia.⁹¹

- ii. Since Hurrians exerted a wide influence in the areas of North Syria and South East Asia Minor (“Kizzuwatna”) in the middle of the 2nd millennium BC, contact could have happened through the Levant either in the Late Bronze Age or the Iron Age, if knowledge of these songs had survived in the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of North Syria, such as Carchemish. We know that Greeks were active in this region at this time, for example at the site of Al Mina, only a few miles to the North of Mons Kasios (Mt. Hazzi in the *Song of Ullikummi*). As Robin Lane-Fox points out, the fact that the Greeks know Mt. Hazzi by its Hurro-Hittite name rather than by its Phoenician one may provide a clue as to the process of transmission.⁹²
- iii. The Greeks tended to associate Typhon with Corycus in Western Cilicia, and one of the later sources for the myth—the poet Oppian (2nd century CE)—seems to have had knowledge of the local mythology. We know nothing about the LBA background of Corycus or the nearby sanctuary of Olba, where native Anatolian traditions were still alive in the Hellenistic period, although it should be noted that these sites were close to Kizzuwatna, where Hurrian influence is known to have been strong. All things being equal, Corycus is a good candidate for being the conduit through which LBA myths about the Storm-god and the Monster passed from the East to Greece, and possibly also for being the place where

⁸⁹ Burkert (1979); Haas (2006) 172–174. Another possible case is the Lydian myth of Tylos and Masnes, on which see Hanfmann (1958) 68–72; also Chuvin (1991).

⁹⁰ Watkins (1995).

⁹¹ Xanthos of Lydia, summarised by Strabo, describing “changes” that happened to Lydia (Strabo 12.8.19 = *FGrHist* 765F13a); Chuvin (1991) 105.

⁹² Lane-Fox (2008). Lopez-Ruiz (2006) has pointed out other points of contact between Greek theogonies and West semitic material, e.g. between Kronos and the Ugaritic deity El, the father of Baal, who, she suggests, like Kronos is not entirely removed from the scene after the coming to power of Baal, but retains some authority, and is also associated with the carnivalesque themes of drunkenness and excess. There seems to have been a general awareness in Greek writers that the name Kronos could be understood as Khronos (“Time”), and it is can be shown that Time (*’Ulom*) played an important role in early Phoenician cosmogonies.

Hurrian storm-god myths underwent a degree of syncretism with native Anatolian ones.⁹³

- iv. To complicate matters, it is possible that transmission from East to West happened *via* an intermediary culture. A likely intermediary would be Crete. Again, that could have happened in the Bronze Age or the Iron Age, or perhaps it passed to Crete in the LBA and then on to Greece (Delphi? Cf. the Cretan origin of Delphic priesthood in the *Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo*) in the Iron Age.

Of these, possibilities ii. and iii. seem the likeliest, partly because KIH is best attested in this region and partly because Greek sources later than Hesiod associate Typhon with Mons Kasios and with Corycus. Which of these routes we choose affects our view of the date of transmission: via Anatolia and it is probably Late Bronze Age, via the Levant or Cilicia and it is more likely (but not necessarily) the 1st millennium.

As to the agents of transmission, a strong possibility is that transmitters were religious experts, and possibly singers. The idea that the myth passes from the Near East to Greece in a non-poetic form and is subsequently set to verse by Greek poets, so that we end up with songs in the two traditions is surely less likely than that bilingual singers, used to a performance tradition in one culture, gave rise to a similar form of theogonic song for Greece. Bilingual singers are no surprise: we have to postulate them anyway for Bronze Age Anatolia (cf. Archi [2007]), and they are attested in recent history.⁹⁴ The context could be either cult or political authority (in so far as these can be distinguished). In a recent article Mary Bachvarova suggests singers passed from one culture to another with the importation of cult-personnel, while Carolina Lopez-Ruiz (2006) suggests that theogonic poetry might have passed from country to country in spells.⁹⁵ As well as the cultic dimension, it is also worth considering the possibility that the motivation for importing this sort of material was that songs about primeval divine succession were felt to be an important part of state-ritual.⁹⁶

⁹³ Notice, however, that Houwink ten Cate (1961) 205–215, thinks that Corycus was traditionally associated with the Illuyankas myth.

⁹⁴ Kolsti (1990) on Bosnian singers able to compose orally in Serbo-Croatian or Albanian.

⁹⁵ Bachvarova (2009); Lopez-Ruiz (2006).

⁹⁶ Cf. Auffahrt (1991) on kingly renewal and Kristiansen and Larsson (2005) 62–107 on how cultural exchange was motivated by elites.

As to what version of the Near Eastern myth was transmitted, it is difficult to do anything more precise than to list possibilities. The chief ones are: i) something very close to the Hurrian KIHC; ii) a hypothetical “pre-Hurrian koine” of the sort postulated by Kirk; iii) the Phoenician version, as described by Philo, which may itself be derived from the Hurrian KIHC; iv) a hypothetical Luvian version current in SE Anatolia in the first millennium BC (cf. the importance of Corycus in the Greek tradition); v) a sort of Anatolian synthesis of the Hurrian KIHC and the Hattic-Hittite Illuyanka-story. There are other possibilities as well, and, to make things even more complex, several phases of transmission may be in play: for example, as well as a transmission before Hesiod, we might also postulate a secondary transmission in the 6th century BC (for the Orphic cosmogony) and another one in the Roman period (Oppian, perhaps Nonnus or his source).

In favour of i. is the transregional status that we know the KIHC enjoyed in Syria and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age; it was clearly a work of great significance for the cultures of the time, resembling in that respect the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, so that it is in principle more likely that Greek singers would have looked to this very work rather than some lost archetype. However, if we want to go for i) (and we accept the authenticity of Philo’s Phoenician version), we would have also to accept that both Hesiodic and Phoenician versions simplified the double line of descent to a single one. For that reason, it might be better to work on the assumption that the Near Eastern myth that the Greeks encountered was already one with a single line of development, e.g. the Phoenician one. Kirk has argued that aspects of the Hurrian and Hesiodic versions are so different that the latter cannot have evolved from the former, so that it is necessary to postulate a “pre-Hurrian koine”; thus, the Hesiodic mythological schema of Kronos swallowing his children to conceal them is not derived from the Hurrian mythological schema of Kumarbi’s pregnancy, but rather both evolve from an original schema: young god emerges from the body of older god. Kirk may, however, have underestimated the creativity of Greek poets, and it could be that they introduced changes themselves, either to fit in with established Greek religious traditions, or (as in the case of Kumarbi’s oral coupling with Anu) out of a sense of religious decorum (cf. the stance Pindar takes towards imputing cannibalism to the gods in the *First Olympian*).

Against a background of such uncertainty, we cannot hope to give a precise account of Hesiod’s position in the process of transmission. In principle, two factors are compatible with a close involvement of Hesiod

in the reception of Near Eastern mythology, namely first that he was a singer (for the idea that singers might have been agents in transmission, see above), and, second, his links to the emerging trade networks of the Eastern Mediterranean in the 8th century BC. Robin Lane Fox has recently argued eloquently that Hesiod's Euboean connections gave him access to the accounts of the Greeks who colonized Al Mina in the 8th century BC, and many have heard of performances of the KIHC, or a later version of it, which were still going on at nearby Mt. Hazzî/Kasios.⁹⁷ This would make Hesiod more or less contemporaneous with the moment that the Near Eastern myth reached the Greek world. But there are many other possibilities, and it is just as likely that the myth had been known in Greece for several generations before Hesiod, perhaps even from as early as the Late Bronze Age.

⁹⁷ Lane-Fox. (2008), especially ch. 20.

THE POETRY OF THE *THEOGONY*

PIETRO PUCCI

Introduction

The first line of the *Theogony* Μουσάων Ἑλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' αἰείδειν, "With the Heliconian Muses, let us begin the song" opens up an extraordinary event: besides its four long "o" sounds which grant magnificence (Aristides, *On Rhet.* I, 14), the emphatic plural gives an unexpected preeminence and energy to the poet's decision (the hortatory subjunctive) to begin his song. This beginning, in other words, is given no reasons or grounds except the will of the poet: it would be therefore useless to ask where it came from, what produced it. It is the pure coming into being of an event and, like the coming into being of Chasm and Gaia, it has no reasons and no explanations. The poet, however, will set forth why he begins his song with the Muses, though not why he begins from their place on Helicon, rather than from their familiar place on Olympus.¹

Immediately he begins to praise them: he celebrates the place of their cult and the altar of Zeus around which they perform "beautiful, lovely dances" (1–9).² The combination of two epithets is a rare and very laudatory rhetorical feature. The significance of these details is broad. First, to celebrate the Muses, especially the beauty of their dancing and singing, implies praise of the poem that they will inspire.³ It is therefore a sort of autoreferential way for archaic poetry to speak about itself. One distinctive and familiar device of poetry is that of foregrounding itself⁴ and this is just what Hesiod does here.

¹ With this gesture Hesiod grants Pan-Hellenic citizenship to the cult of his country's Muses, identifying them with the traditional Olympian Muses and ascribing to them dual cult centers, Helicon and Olympus.

² They dance without musical accompaniment; Pucci (2007) 40, Jaillardat (2007) 176: "The Muses seem to ignore the lyre."

³ See Laird (2002) 128.

⁴ See Culler (1997) 28–29: "Literature is language that 'foregrounds' language itself: makes it strange, thrusts it at you ... In particular poetry organizes the sound plane of language, so as to make it something to reckon with."

We are immediately confronted with the beauty of the Muses' bodies: "they dance on their soft feet" ... "wash their tender skin ...". As Detienne has underscored,⁵ one of the most precious intuitions of W.F. Otto in his study of the Greek Gods has been to emphasize the salient importance of the body in the Greek representation of the Gods. The beauty, the radiance, the immortal youth of their bodies are manifestations of their divinity and exclusive blessedness. In these features they are very far from being "anthropomorphic" as an old and erroneous conception considers them to be.

Finally, the mention of the altar of Zeus, around which the Muses dance, anticipates the narrative of their birth from Mnemosyne and Zeus. Zeus' paternity is the most dynamic trait in the unfolding of the religious and poetic tenet that structures the whole poem. For, this paternity implies that the Muses envisage the whole development of the divine world from the point of view of the *telos* that Zeus represents. Though the text does not display any ideological pact between the Muses and Zeus, it shows nevertheless that Zeus mirrors himself in their song at once as its main theme and its indirect producer.

Lacking the Indic goddess *Word* ("Vac"), Hesiod absolutely needs a means of access to the divine source, since only the gods can know and speak about themselves. This is the initial metaphysical act of Hesiod's poetics, by which I mean the poetic key that allows him to enter the world of the gods. Accordingly, he has the Muses coming to him and narrating the story of the birth and of the conflictual development of the cosmos and of the gods.

In these first nine lines of the proem (1-115), we realize in what way the religious material of the text becomes a poetic event and "foregrounds" its poetic nature. The archaic Greek poet did not think of the religious material he wanted to communicate as being distinct from the poetic nature of his language. Therefore, as we have seen, the text is poetic both because, like the Homeric poems, it uses a special language and rhythm, and because it unfolds in accordance with a dynamic poetic principle that defines its particular poetics.

Let us expand on these two aspects of the "poetic" nature of Hesiod's text. The *Theogony* tells its story through the special Pan-Hellenic language that is the diction of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the Homeric Hymns. Episodes of war, edifying death, storms at sea, adultery, divine

⁵ Detienne (1981).

trickery or praise of the gods employ the same language, and a similar sublime tone. In so far as this epic language is the Muses', it is able to say whatever it wants to say. And this is the proper and specific privilege of poetry, to say whatever it wants.⁶ Furthermore, as the reference to the altar of Zeus has suggested, the text announces at its start the religious and poetic principle of its coherence and of its creative force. This principle is anchored in Zeus in so far as he will be the *telos* of the coming into being of the cosmic world, a cessation of indiscriminate and endless proliferations (Gaia's fertility), of dangerous rivalries (children against fathers, brothers against brothers, etc.), of sinister monstrosities, etc. In a more abstract formulation, the figure and the function of Zeus could be read as the principle of unity, harmony and identity winning conflicts, stopping uncontrolled disseminations and putting an end to the infinite energy and fertility of difference.

These two tendencies seething with dynamic contrast in the cosmic-divine world—the rush toward unity/identity and the endless production of often incongruous differentiations—are thematically represented as features of the Muses' language itself. For they announce a split in their own language when they say that they can both sing the truth, and utter many lies similar to truths (*Th.* 27–28). Truth implies unity of language with its referent, lies like truths gesture toward manipulations, hidden differences, imitations. The poetic principle and the religious one mesh with one another at the source of their conception and it is impossible to say which one produces the other. It is by embodying some of the tensions between these two principles that the great Hesiodic figures emerge, Kronos, Zeus, Pandora, Prometheus, Aphrodite, destined to become central icons in the culture of the West.

The style of the Theogony

West in his 1966 edition writes: "Hesiod's is an epic vocabulary, of more interest for its difference from the Homeric repertory than for what it has in common."⁷ Indeed this difference has been uncovered and analyzed by several scholars, Sellshopp (1934), West himself (1966), G.P. Edwards (1971), Arrighetti (1989–1990) and (1998) XXXI–XXXIV, Tsagalis (2006a).

⁶ On this particular feature of poetic language, see Derrida (1992) 37 ff.

⁷ West (1966) 77.

One of the main novelties of the vocabulary concerns the epithets for the gods (including the designation of Zeus as “king” *basileus*), for their being and actions and in particular for those of the Muses,—their voices,⁸ their functions etc. The Homeric formulae take on new employment: they are not simply used as a sort of metonymy describing the various beings and entities, but now often serve as signals of reference to other passages; they are used to open or close themes or motifs (ring-composition: e.g. 21, 33, and 105; 25 and 52; 37 and 51, etc.); the resemantization of epithets is a remarkable new aspect of Hesiod’s language. As Rossi (1978) 127 has written, “the formular system of Homeric poetry, turns into a poetic style.”

Hesiod is fond of paradoxes, etymological references, and wordplays: none of these stylistical devices is used gratuitously (on the principle of *ars gratia artis*), but rather to specific poetic ends.⁹

Instead of pursuing a detailed analysis of Hesiod’s language, I prefer to describe his style. His style does not reach the sublime dramatic force of the *Iliad*, and it is far from the ironic, sentimental and enchanting mode of the *Odyssey*.¹⁰ The style of the *Theogony* is more concrete, rapid and abstract than that of the two Homeric poems, for its narrative unfolds

⁸ See among the new expressions that qualify the voice of the Muses the following: περικαλλέα ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι (v. 10), ἄμβροτον ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι (v. 43), διὰ στόμα ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι (v. 65), ἐπήρατον ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι (v. 67). The innovations are not gratuitous: three different epithets for metrical adaptation introduce the phrase ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι that presumably contains an etymological play on the name *Hesiodos*. Moreover, there is a revaluation of the word ὄσσα, that in Homer designates only “rumour”, and the sigmatismus. For the etymological play see Nagy (1979) 296–297 and Metier (1996) 43, who in agreement with Schulze, Solmsen and Frisk interprets the name *Hēsiodos* as *hēsi-* (from *hiēmi* “I launch”, and from *Fodoḥ that would be connected to αὐδή “voice”: “the one who launches the voice”). Bader (1989) 269 prefers a different etymological explanation of the first part of the word, but reaches an analogous meaning; Chantraine (*DELG*) and West (n. 22) are skeptical on *-odos* as connected to αὐδή “voice”. If Nagy’s etymology was recognized by the poet, he would have realized that his name designated the very function of the Muses, and would become aware of attributing a divine figure to his own voice. This relation between the divine voice and the poet’s name could also explain the exclusive presence of this formula in the hymn.

⁹ Thus, for instance, the paradoxes (e.g. 27, 54–55) illustrate the “miraculous” power of poetry that simultaneously produces memory and oblivion, truths and lies, that is both sweet and violent; the etymologies of the names (e.g. the names of the Muses, of Aphrodite, of Hecate) testify to the poetic rush toward a language that may be identical with the entities to which it refers, and leave no span, no distance between the name and the being of the entity so named.

¹⁰ By an elaborated comparison between Homer’s and Hesiod’s representation of poet and audience, Tsagalis (2006a) is able to show, within generic cohesion, the fluid framework of the traditional model.

along its backbone of genealogical catalogues and the expansions of short stories and episodes. The strong ethical concern that inspires the whole work has suggested that Hesiod's utterances can be compared with those of a Jewish prophet. Indeed, the narrative voice turns toward frequent blames or praises: on the one hand, the Muses' insults directed against the poets, Gaia's and Rhea's predicaments in the face of the violence of their mates, the irresponsible provocation by Prometheus; on the other the unlimited praise of Hecate, of Zeus' strategies and justice.

No matter how primitive the organisation of the whole cosmos through the genealogical principle may appear, it constitutes nevertheless a sort of rationalization in explaining relationships between the beings, and the process of cosmic conflict through which they come into being. In fact the genealogical principle often builds similarities, contiguities along a whole lineage, or, on the contrary, contrasts, differences, rivalry and competitions.

Yet the genealogical principle activates a fictional view of the gods that in fact constitutes the main anthropomorphic aspect of the Hesiodic gods. Although, as has been shown in recent years, the Greek gods are not anthropomorphic (they could not have been thought to reside in their statues if they were), nevertheless, because of the genealogical principle, they assume in Hesiod strong anthropomorphic characteristics and, just as in Homer, they are motivated by human impulses, sex, lust, desire for power and for absolute control. Shrewdness, trickery and violence are their means to ensure the satisfaction of these desires. The gods are therefore difficult to understand and to describe: Hesiod must be aware of this difficulty if he seriously believes the language of poetry to be always on the brink of stating falsehoods and truths.

Together with *Works and Days*, the *Theogony* constitutes "an embryonic philosophical system which is obviously molded in archaic forms, anticipating the first steps of the presocratic philosophy." (Ferrari [1992] 142)¹¹

Th. 1–115: The Hymn to the Muses

Friedländer (1914) recognized in the proem of the *Theogony* some features of form and content traits that are characteristic of the hymnic

¹¹ The bibliography on this specific aspect of the *Theogony* is vast: see Fränkel (1960); Gigon (1945); Diller (1946); Schwabl (1986).

literature we know through the collection of the Homeric Hymns. As Arrighetti ([1998] 308) makes clear, subsequent research (Bradley [1966], Verdenius [1972], Aloni [1992], [1998]), not to mention Arrighetti himself ([1998] 307–309), has confirmed Friedländer's thesis and enriched the analysis of formal data in particular.

One remarkable aspect deserves mention, the fact that the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* have proems that have remained attached to the main text.¹² The long celebration of the Muses and the narrative of their *bios* prove the crucial importance of these fascinating and mysterious figures. The Muses remain one of the most enigmatic and exclusive inventions of Greek culture. In recent years scholars have uncovered numerous correspondences of themes and details between Hesiod and the Near-Eastern theogonic literature (Babylonian, Hittite, Ugaritic, etc.) but the Muses remain genuinely Greek. As West writes: "the idea of a deity putting a song in the singer's mind is not unknown [in the Eastern tradition] ... but there is no deity specialized in this function, and none is petitioned for such a boon. The Muses are, so far as we know, purely Greek creatures, and have no counterpart in the Orient." ([1997] 170).

The most salient episodes of the Hymn are Hesiod's encounter with the Muses, the Muses' birth from Mnemosyne and Zeus, and the visualizing of their favours to kings and poets.

Th. 26–28: "Field-dwelling shepherds, evil disgraces, mere bellies, we know how to say many false things similar to real ones, but we know, when we wish, how to sing true things."

These words are thrust by the Muses into Hesiod's mouth: it is almost impossible to imagine how the poet could have performed this scene before an audience.

The scholarly consensus on these words is that the Muses can utter lies and truths, as they wish; yet the explanation in line 27 of how (which, when, etc.) *pseudea* (false things) are similar to real things (*etumoisin*), has found no consensus at all. One group of scholars essentially tries to identify which aspects of some poems may be defined as fictions that nevertheless convey some truths,¹³ or which features may be defined as

¹² We do not know during what religious festival the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* were performed.

¹³ A good example of this interpretation is offered by Wismann (1997), for whom the *Theogony* through fiction (*pseudea*) unfolds true meanings about which later philosophy will argue.

fully false;¹⁴ others prefer to identify the poems (all poetry, or the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* alone) against which Hesiod would thrust this Musean condemnation;¹⁵ still others prefer to understand in the notion of “similar to real things” as an early formulation of “imitation”.¹⁶ Accordingly, the text would present a sort of proto-Platonic view: the Muses can use imitations that distort things, though making them believable as truths; but when they want, they can sing full truths, i.e. songs without imitation, songs identical to the things they sing about.

The extraordinary boldness of these lines should not be reduced by palliative readings: no matter how line 27 is interpreted, what remains stated is that the Muses are able to inspire lies, undetected by poets and audiences, because they are similar to real things. The scattering of differences and the rush toward unity and identity are the features that characterise the language of the Muses, and in fact all languages, in all eras.

Hesiod, of course, does not articulate this situation: he knows that the Muses know and can sing the full truth, and moreover he recounts (29–34) the act of investiture through which the Muses made him their minister (see *therapôn*, *Th.* 100): accordingly he and his audience may feel assured that they will tell him the truth.¹⁷

The paradox of line 27 is followed by the paradox of line 54–55: “In Pieria, mingling in love with the father, the son of Cronos, Mnemosyne bore them to be oblivion of evils and relief from anxieties.”

Mnemosyne (memory) and *lesmosyne* (oblivion, forgetfulness) are placed at the beginning of lines 54 and 55: these rhyming words carry the same rhythm, but have opposite meanings. The pointed paradox illustrates the portentous power of poetry, its capability of going beyond all limits in saying anything at all, and making sense of it.

¹⁴ See for instance Svenbro (1976) 59 ff. with the *pseudea* Hesiod could refer to the epic choric genealogies of poets who flatter their masters in order to be fed and protected.

¹⁵ An odd and extreme form of this type of interpretation seems to me that of Latte (1946) 159 and 161 ff., who believes that what the Muses call “lies similar to true things” is the nature of the heroic song, performed for an aristocratic audience: this song is an ornament of life (*Schmück des Daseins*), is tendentious, and aims at exciting and entertaining listeners. The Hesiodic song, on the contrary, is useful and is intended for farmers.

¹⁶ See Detienne (1967); Pucci (1977); Arthur (1983) 104–106; Clay-Strauss (2003) 57 ff.; Ledbetter (2003) 43 ff.

¹⁷ Some scholars believe that Hesiod nevertheless should not be so confident: see Ledbetter (2003).

This paternity inscribes Zeus in the Muses' song: he has generated these offspring in order to receive pleasure from them (36 ff.—just as they sing a genealogical piece that includes him, of course), and to be celebrated by them as they sing: “he is the king in the sky holding the thunder and the blazing thunderbolt” (71–72). Nobody ever sang any praise for Cronos or Uranos: these gods lacked the crucial power of the media.

The birth from Mnemosyne connects the Muses with “memory”, but not simply memory as the capacity to “recall past events” but as the capacity to “re-enact” (*mimesis*) them through song. By this “re-enacting” Vernant, Nagy,¹⁸ Bakker, Kahane and others imply, though with different nuances, that in the poet's mind the task of poetry was to reproduce events as they had happened, so that the audience would be present at the re-occurrence of those events.

This view attributes to the epic poet the awareness of possessing magic or religious powers, as if the retelling, by a magic touch, could situate the audience at the time of those events, in the presence of the characters' *actual* acts and words. The Muses in Hesiod's text raise some doubts as to the univocal and absolute character of this pretension: they are right to warn the audience that they say many lies similar to real things. They know that there are competitive versions of the same events and that there is rhetorical manipulation, invention and imitation in their performance.

Hesiod broadens the idea that poetry cures the pains and anxieties of mortals in lines 96–104, without, however, explaining by what means it does so: possibly the sublime re-enactment of heroic deeds and divine lives produces effects that quench the contingencies of human pain and sufferings.

In the previous lines (80–92) the text involves the Muses and Zeus¹⁹ in inspiring justice in some kings: a task that in the extant literature is exceptional for the Muses.

¹⁸ (1996) 96 ff.

¹⁹ The presence of Zeus is perhaps indicated by line 82 where the kings are called *diotrepheis* (“nourished by Zeus”, in a metaphorical sense): this epithet, frequent in Homer as a metonymic-ornamental adjective, is very rare in Hesiod, and here it could have a pregnant signification, implying the kings whom Zeus cares for. On the whole question, see the convincing paper of Laks (1996).

Th. 116–122: The origin of the world

“In truth, first of all Chasm²⁰ came to be, and then broad-breasted Gaia, the ever stable seat of all the immortals who possess snowy Olympus’ summit ...” (116–118). Betegh writes ([2004] 177): the *Theogony*, in comparison with Apollodorus’ *Bibliotheca* and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* “installs a singular, unified, comprehensive temporality.”²¹

However difficult to visualize as a specific figure, Chasm is nevertheless a productive being: it has two lineages of descendants, one with Erebus and Night (123–125), the other starting from Night (211–232).

Gaia (Earth) is called (line 117), once in all Hesiod, *eurusternos* (‘large breasted’), not so much to indicate her maternal production, which will be vast, but the extension of her body which is immense, as her regular epithets indicate: *pelôrê* (*Th.* 159, etc.), *apeirona gaian* (*Th.* 187), *megalê* (*Th.* 622; Bacch. 5, 224), *megistê* (Solon 30, 4). She provides the vast seat of the gods in Olympus, an assertion that is proleptic since Gaia will produce mountains only in line 129. For the archaic Greek poets the peak of Olympus, seat of the Gods, is identical with Heaven: (see lines 127–128). Gaia is the “stable”, “immovable” (*asphales*) seat of all the immortals: such a definition of Gaia, with the protective innuendo that it implies, is never used for mortal beings.

In the course of the narrative Gaia is the mother or the progenitor of the whole cosmic and divine world (with the sole exception of Chasm);²² she embodies the energy that animates all the stories; she is “the infinite fertility of difference.”²³ This creative difference unfolds as her constant fertility, whereby she is both cause and effect of her self, and constantly dispossessed, for she is in whatever she creates and yet she possesses nothing of what she creates. She has no assured identity. This process of fertility becomes obvious at some moments, such as, for example,

²⁰ On Chaos, “chasm, gap, opening,” and its coming to be, see F. Solmsen, *Gnomon* 40, (1968) 325; Kirk-Raven-Scofield (1983) 38; H. Podbielski, *LEC* 54 (1986) 253–263.

²¹ The beginning of this unified temporality leads to the *telos*, when the ultimate king gains supremacy: accordingly, in Mesopotamia the New Year ritual apparently made an explicit link between the human ruler and Marduk, the divine king, but this does not occur in Greece where we do not know on what ritual occasions the *Theogony* was performed, with one possible exception: it was presumably performed at the funeral of the king Amphidamas (*WD* 654–655).

²² In Hesiod Gaia is mentioned basically only in the *Theogony* (23 times), and only once outside the *Theogony* in fr. 150.11 (Hofinger [1975]). Her frequent Hesiodic epithet *pelôrê* ‘huge’ is never used in Homer.

²³ Wismann (1996) 20.

when by internal self-differentiation she creates from herself Uranos (Sky, Heaven) in 126–127 (“She bore starry Sky, equal to herself to cover her on every side ...”), the mountains (129) or Pontos (131–132).²⁴ It is vain to ask whether Uranos is or is not part of Gaia: he is in some way both, a sort of “differed” Gaia.

Otherwise she procreates by sexual intercourse, giving birth for instance to Oceanos (130)²⁵ and the Titans: Eros indeed is one of the first divine beings to come into being (120–122).²⁶ She also favors the life and growth of the newborns, against the will of their fathers and tries in this way to limit or even annihilate the latters’ destructive force. Gaia seems to have no hands: she always needs someone else, a male, to act in her place: even when she creates a weapon she does not handle it: she needs Cronos in order to use it. Fertility, therefore, seems unable to use violence directly: it can create weapons and even monsters in so far as it is fertility, but it cannot betray or contradict itself by using violence to destroy.²⁷ Yet fertility is rich in shrewdness and trickery (see 175, 626, etc.) Insofar as she is fertility, as we have seen, Gaia possesses nothing of what she creates: accordingly, she has no *timai* (“honours”) to give.

This whole program promoting proliferation, constant change, and differentiations keeps the world moving and creates extraordinary events (to mention only the castration of Uranos, the birth of Aphrodite in the middle of the sea, from Uranos’ seed, of Typhoeus), but threatens the stability of the cosmos and forbids or delays control by a single supreme power. The last creature Gaia begets is Typhoeus, the monstrous assemblage of incongruous limbs. Zeus uses fire to fight the monster and “ultimately puts an end to Earth’s fecundity; he must neutralize her strategy of always siding with the younger against the older generations in order to promote change at the expense of cosmic stability.”²⁸

Without any overt conflict, Gaia is deprived little by little of her essence (fertility) and attributes (for instance her prophetic power), and she is

²⁴ See Rudhardt (1971) 55–56.

²⁵ On the relationship between Oceanos and the world of Hades see Zannini Quirini (1987).

²⁶ On lines 121–122 and Archilochos fr. 196 (West), see Janko (1982) 96. Eros is *kallistos* (“most handsome”): no other god, except Aphrodite, is called *kallistos* in Hesiod; see Sellschopp (1934) 31.

²⁷ See Heidegger, *Holzwege* 31: “Earth is that whence the arising as such brings back and shelters everything that arrives without violation. In the things that arise, earth is present as the sheltering agent” (Hofstadter’s translation p. 42).

²⁸ Strauss Clay (2003) 26.

replaced in her advising capacity by Metis when Zeus makes her his wife and then swallows her (886 ff.). Gaia remains a nude and devastated entity.

The conflict is not overt but its champions are explicit and identifiable: they are the “figures” of identity and of unequivocalness, i.e. the kings and especially Zeus, the father of the Muses. The conflict is already announced in the double register of the Muses’ song, marked by imitation and therefore by difference, but simultaneously gesturing toward *aletheia*, i.e. toward the identity of the words with what the words make present and celebrate. The conflict therefore lies at the start of the representation of the cosmos and wriggles through the whole poem with its diverse “figures”: those who, like the Muses, participate in both registers, the poet himself as *Mousaôn therapôn* (110), Prometheus and Pandora, and those who, like Zeus, aim at an exclusive control of the whole world, imprinting on it, also through the Muses, his mind and will. The distribution of *timai* makes every god a representative of Zeus’ power. This conflict wriggles through the poem, even unchecked by the poet, for as the author calls the poet a *therapôn* of the Muses he evokes the intermediary figure of the substitute, of the *alter ego*, the figure who like Thamyras (*Il.* 2) and, on another level, Patroclus, represents the paradoxical position of the “supplement”. If, indeed, they try to exercise the full power of their masters, they exceed their limits and are destined to destruction, as Thamyras and Patroclus prove; but if they remain within the limits granted to the “substitute”, they are always inferior to their masters’ powers, and therefore, they perform as “copies”, “surrogates”, marked by the difference of imitation. Accordingly the poet as *therapôn* of the Muses lies in the same paradoxical position: if he imitates the goddesses, he goes beyond his human limits, and destroys himself; if he functions within his substitute role he is a copy, a ghost writer, an imitator. The interaction, the intercourse of divine and human natures is unthinkable except through the paradox and instability of difference. Since difference cannot be simply effaced and annulled—it is constitutive of language—it will also continue to characterise figures of identity such as Zeus: his distribution of powers will stabilize his power but also create tensions, gaps, and absences.

A certain collision and fray is suffered by Gaia at the hands of man in the famous Sophoclean passage in *Antigone* (332 ff.). Often praised as an “ode to human progress”, in fact this ode implies some violence of man against Gaia (339–340): “and he wears away (*apotruetai*) the highest, immortal infatigable Earth, as he ploughs ...”

Even today, the conflict between Gaia and the “world” (its need for security, order, mining, systematic production, etc.) carries on to the detriment of Gaia.

Th. 126–210: the descendants of Gaia

By generating six males and six females with Uranos—her son and mate—Gaia creates a male kingship (the Titans), with its supreme chief and its potential rivals. Cronos turns up immediately as such a rival, in lines 136–137, for he is put in evidence by lines 137–138 as “the youngest of all, crooked-minded, (*agkulomêtês*), the most terrible of her children; and he hated his vigorous father.” Along with the Titans, the Cyclops and the three Hundred-Handers²⁹ were also generated by Gaia and Uranos, but Uranos hated all of his children and as soon as any of them, Titans or others, were born “he hid them in a deep place in Gaia’s immense body and did not allow them to come up to light: he rejoiced in this evil deed.” (155–159). This last statement is an editorial aside by the Muses and Hesiod. Huge Gaia was constricted (notice the *callida iunctura*: *pelôrê/steinomenê*, 159–160) and in pain; she devised an evil trick (with “evil”, the focalizer seems to be Hesiod) and created a sickle of adamant, obtained Cronos’ help and placed him in a position to ambush Uranos.

With a few exceptions, the text underlines the focalisation by Gaia herself as it emphasizes her pain, her “dear children” (162) and has her insisting on Uranos’ prior guilt (166). She also takes full responsibility for the deed: see the shift from “you” to the emphatic “we” (165–166). Uranos, however, will curse only his children (207–210).

“Uranos came bringing Night with him and spreading himself around Gaia in his desire for intercourse” (*himeirôn philotêtos*, 176–177).³⁰ Uranos’ desire for intercourse is brutally frustrated by Cronos who “reaped

²⁹ There is a difficulty in the narrative: these Beings suffer the same fate as the Titans, yet they do not appear to be liberated by Cronos when he frees the Titans, since they are unexpectedly described as being still in bonds when Zeus liberates them (see 501–506 and 617–626).

³⁰ For this meaning of *philotes*, see Pironti (2007) 38–69, who evokes for Uranos’ gesture of covering the whole Gaia the analogous examples of Zeus in *Il.* 14.343–345, as he creates a golden cloud, and Poseidon in *Od.* 11.243–250, who covers the scene with a wave like a mountain. Each god uses the matter of his own domain.

the genitals from his dear father and threw them behind him" (180–181).³¹ From the bloody drops of Uranos' semen falling on the ground, Gaia bears the Erinyes, the Giants and the Melian Nymphs (185–187). The text composes a short catalogue around these Beings; in line 185 the chiasmus connects and puts into tension the revengeful Erinyes and the warlike Giants. The birth of the Erinyes at this moment is not casual: they will in fact constitute Uranos' rights of revenge (470–473) for his son's crime. The Giants deserve an epithetic line: "shining in their weapons and holding the long spears in their hands" (cf. *Il.* 17.214; 20.46), again in some chiasitic order. The strong "kh" sound in the last part of the line (186) creates a unifying assonance. The Melian Nymphs are in the trees from which in *WD* 145 Zeus draws the bronze race (cf. West [1966]). The vigorous (*thaleros*, 138) Uranos has already produced a generation of powerful, violent Beings (139, 147–148), the Cyclopes, the Hundred-Handers, and the Titans. The next birth and the last, therefore the most important, is the birth of Aphrodite. She is born from Uranos' semen as it falls into the sea and forms a white foam (190 ff.); she has the shape of a beautiful maiden goddess (194),³² and she comes to life without the intervention of any mother. The text narrates the whole episode with simple economic energy, pleasant ironic traits (notice the verb "reaped" [181] so gruesomely consonant with the implement used, the sickle),³³ and the delightful, provocative etymological puns to explain the traditional epithet of Aphrodite (*Urania* and *philommeidês*, "smile-loving")³⁴ from the *mêdea*, the "genitals" of Uranos (200). The dissemination of Uranos' semen, and especially its forming an *aphros* in the sea, a foam of

³¹ An apotropaic gesture (West [1966]) or a gesture to escape contamination, see Vasta (2004).

³² See Pirenne-Delforge (2001) 90.

³³ On the adaptation of the Iliadic formula used for spears (e.g. 14.407: "fruitless it sped from his hand") in line 182, see Palmer (1980) 102.

³⁴ Hesiod interprets the name *Aphrodite* from *aphrôs* ("foam"), and by a pun takes the second part of the traditional epithet *philommeidês* "smile-loving" as if it were derived from *mêdos* "genitals" (200 ff.). But *mêdea* (in the plural) is used also formulaically for the immortal "counsels" of Zeus: on this ambiguity see Nagy (1974) 265–278. On the comparison between Aphrodite and Athena, both born from a male, see the vibrant pages of Pironti (2007) 55 ff. On the connections between Aphrodite and the Phoenician Astarte, and on the remarkable parallel between lines 205–206 and a passage in a Babylonian hymn to Ishtar, see West (1997) 56 ff. and 291. On the double birth of Aphrodite, from Uranos' seed and from Zeus, see Betegh (2004) 161. For an instructive essay on the birth of Aphrodite in contrast to that of Athena, and on the kinetic energy of the myth exploding from its words, see Leclerc (1978).

composite nature, goes along with a certain drift of meanings through etymological play. Aphrodite emerges as a unique and very complex Being.

The gruesome delight of the narrative does not detract in any way from the huge symbolic significance of the castration of Cronos, an image that in folklore suggests the separation between earth and sky; in psychoanalytic terms it is the step the son must symbolically accomplish to gain the authority held back by the father; circumcision as a ritual, exorcising the anxious gesture of castration, etc.

In our text, the castration makes Uranos an asexual partner of Gaia, allied to her even against his and her children. He undergoes the same decline Gaia suffers in the poem. Outside the poem, he enjoys no known cult.

The succession myth

The most important effect of this episode within the text of the *Theogony* is that of establishing the first model of a father's hostility toward his children. In this way it sets in motion an extraordinary series of repetitions and differences that organise the ascension to and the fall from power of Cronos and, to some extent, of Zeus. Cronos and Zeus, in particular, in the lineage of Gaia and Uranos, follow Uranos' example in countering the dangerous birth of their own children by swallowing or hiding them. Cronos had heard from Gaia and Uranos that he would lose the honor of kingship among the immortals, since he would "be overpowered by a child of his, through the plans of great Zeus" (464–465).³⁵ For this reason he swallowed up his children.

But Rhea obtains Gaia's help, sends the infant Zeus to Crete, and gives Cronos a stone wrapped in swaddling-clothes: "Cronos seized this with his hands and put it down in his belly, cruel one! (*skhetlios*)" (487–488). The editorial intervention of Hesiod's Muses is obvious in this moral condemnation, especially when it is compared with their description of the similar action Zeus accomplished for the same selfish reasons. "When Metis was about to give birth to bright-eyed Athena, he deceived her mind by trick (*dolôi*) and with guileful words and put her in his belly" (888–890). Zeus was simply smarter than Metis.

³⁵ It would seem that Zeus has been planning Cronos' defeat since his infancy.

If we set aside the focalisation by the Muses, the behaviour of the male kings is the same; the threat to which they are subjected is the same (453 ff. 886 ff.); the *keuthmôn* (cavity) in Gaia's deep body in which Uranos had hidden his children (158) corresponds to Cronos' and Zeus' belly; the cave in Crete where Zeus was saved (483) is a substitute for Cronos' imprisoning belly.

This equivalent behavior does not imply that the three male gods have the same role and nature. Zeus is presented as the typical sky-god, the storm-god by virtue of thunder and lightening (457–458); he is described as such several times, beginning with the proem where his kingship is connected to his storm creating power (72–73). Cronos, for his part, has no such role.³⁶

Zeus is also remarkable for his strength and courage: he has superior force (*biê* and *kratos*) and talents (*tekhne*, *aphthita mêdea eidôs*, etc.); and he fights, as Nagy has shown,³⁷ like an Iliadic Achilles.

All this, however, does not justify the contention of some scholars that Zeus differs from Cronos in moral virtue, in a sort of rational practice and in the use of justice. Neitzel characterizes Zeus' *Herrschaft* as "die ordnende Macht of Vernunft";³⁸ Schmidt implies that Zeus' justice (*Gerechtigkeit*) is recognizable as the underlying absolute means for the creation of *Herrschaft*;³⁹ Wismann⁴⁰ asserts that the principle of Zeus' order is grounded in the distribution of *timai*, the *dasmos*, a principle that makes this order unchangeable and he states: "L'ordre ou la différence joue au coeur même de l'identité, c'est celui de la justice de Zeus." Blümer⁴¹ (2001) states that "the myth of Prometheus is the first ring in a chain of supporting evidence for Zeus: his conquering of the different adversaries (sons of Japetus, Titans, Typhoeus) is the premise (*Voraussetzung*) for the creation of a new, just order of the world." These and other analogous statements seem to me relatively correct only if they refer to

³⁶ The lightning and thunder bestowed by the Cyclopes—children of Uranos—to Zeus were hidden in the Earth (Gaia), from which Gaia produced the *drepanon*: these connections prove the existence of "some links among the original powers Gaia and Uranos and the royal power", see Pironti (2007) 34.

³⁷ (1979) 322 ff.

³⁸ (1975) 108 ff.

³⁹ (1989) 17–37, esp. 34.

⁴⁰ (1966).

⁴¹ (2001), vol. II, 134.

Zeus' creation of a new order, after his victory, but inappropriate and misleading if concern Zeus' strategies and behavior during the conquest of the kingship.

The *dasmos*, the distribution of *timai*, which the Muses and the critics praise in Zeus (*Th.* 73–74, 885), is neither Zeus' exclusive move nor a fair one. On the one hand, Cronos had already enacted a distribution of *timai* as we learn from the Styx and Hecate episodes (*Th.* 392–393 and 423–425, where the previous distribution is also called *dasmos*). In these passages, Zeus finds no wrong in Cronos' distribution. It is in this connection that royal power—and thus order—is assigned also to Cronos (462). Of course the Muses, daughters of Zeus, tell us nothing about Cronos' reign, but nothing also is said against it, either.

On the other hand Zeus' *dasmos* "distribution" is characterized by no special fairness or justice, or balance. In lines 73–74:

... εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα
ἀθανάτοις διέταξεν ὁμῶς καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμὰς.

Zeus assigned well and equally each thing to the immortal gods and showed them the privileges (*timai*).⁴²

The division is done well by Zeus in harmony with the epic principle of distribution of booty (e.g. *Od.* 11.42) and food (e.g. *Il.* 1.468) that is equally in accordance with the importance of each person. Some features are particularly noteworthy. Zeus gathers all possible *timai* for himself, and he himself decides how and to whom to distribute them. This is in striking contrast with *Il.* 15.189–193, where the three brothers Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades divide the world into three parts and then each draw (*emmore*) his own portion. To our sensibility this way of distribution seems fairer than Zeus' way in the *Theogony*, though of course neither of the two texts moralizes upon these approaches. This way, which was employed by Cronos to distribute *timai* to his peers (see *elakhon* in 422 and 424), looks like the one used by Zeus in the *Theogony*, since he gave to Hecate what she deserved or was due.⁴³ There seems to be no difference between father and son in the ethic nature of their distribution.

We find the only voice that comes close to the idea of fairness in 395–396:

⁴² Interpreters tend to translate *epephrade* by "distributed", but this aorist with reduplication of φράζω cannot mean that. We have, I think, a *husteron proteron*, see Pucci (2007) 100.

⁴³ For this meaning of λαγχάνω, see Perpillou (1996) 167 ff.

τὸν δ' ἔφαθ', ὅστις ἄτιμος ὑπὸ Κρόνου ἢ δ' ἀγέραςτος,
τιμῆς καὶ γεράων ἐπιβησέμεν, ἦ θέμις ἐστίν.

and he [Zeus] said that whoever was unhonoured by Cronos and unpri-
vileged, he would set him on the path of honour, as is proper.

Zeus gains royal power and stability by committing what Wismann calls an injustice (“En effet la justice de Zeus repose sur une injustice flagrante: l'exclusion des Titans ...”).⁴⁴ Even though the text does not comment in any moral way on the imprisonment of the Titans, Wismann's statement is correct.

Zeus' ruthlessness and political realism assure his sovereignty and at the same time manage to banish the indiscriminate play of difference and dissemination from the cosmic world. This result has nothing to do with ethics.

We realize that the real privilege of Zeus' characterisation in comparison with Cronos' is the favorable picture that the song of the Muses, his daughters, presents of him. In accordance with their poetic principle in pursuing truth as identity with things as they are, they gesture toward the father as the sole sovereign of the world and forever the same.

Th. 411–452: Hecate

The description of the birth of Zeus is preceded by the so-called “hymn to Hecate”, a definition that reveals the difficulty the passage presents for the critics more than its real genre. In fact, her name, her surprising functions⁴⁵ in the *Theogony* and the place she occupies in the poem are aspects that are debated with very little consensus.

For the etymology of the name scholars evoke the forms *ekôn* (“willing”) or *ekêti* (“by whose will”) in consideration also of the many times the text mentions the condition of her willingness to help humans (e.g. 429, 439 etc.); but the precise realm of her privileges and the specific terms of her willingness remain so indeterminate as to leave no certainty even among readers who espouse a specific coherent interpretation. To

⁴⁴ (1996) 21.

⁴⁵ Hecate is absent in Homer and here makes her entrance in Greek literature. Among her functions she sits in judgement beside the reverent kings (434)—a surprising task since in the *Theogony* the Muses are the inspirers of the kings in their judgements (80 ff.), and in the *Works and Days*, a poem so involved with the royal administration of justice, she is unknown. She, all alone, bestows glory and victory in battle, a privilege that in the *Iliad* is granted to great gods, Zeus, Apollo, Athena, etc.

exemplify, Bollack's successful interpretation (1971) of Hecate's function as that of representing "ubiquity of chance" (*die Allgegenwart des Zufalls*) has inspired Strauss-Clay (1984) for whom Hecate is a sort of mediator, Neitzel (1975) 108 (capriciousness of chance), Wismann (1996) 21 (l'incertitude et la seduction de la promesse), Judet de la Combe (1996) 279 (déesse du hasard et du désordre); yet, notwithstanding the sophisticated nuances each author unfolds, this negative qualification of her functions is hard to reconcile with the enthusiastic tone of her celebration.⁴⁶

The grounds for Zeus' generous gifts to Hecate remain unexplained, so readers must try to derive them from a creative reading of the text. For Zeitlin (1996) and others it is on account of Hecate being *mounogenês* that Zeus lavishes so many privileges on her.

Cronos' and Zeus' generosity to Hecate does not explain, however, why no specific realm or privilege (*timê*) is attributed solely to her: she enjoys a share in many realms that are the specific appanage of other gods.

There are also noteworthy features of style: *dunamis* attributed to a god is Homeric but it is a *hapax* in Hesiod; *dasmos* (425) is a *hapax* in Hesiod and in Homer (*Il.* 1.166). There is a heroic coloration in line 429–439, corresponding to the passage where the text describes Hecate's favours to the nobility; *glaukê* 440 (grey? of the sea, is a *hapax* in Hesiod and Homer (*Il.* 16.34)).⁴⁷ The repetition of words (*moira*, *emmore*, *aisa*, etc.) indicating Hecate's partial sharing of honors, the lack of specific epithets (except *mounogenês*), the repetition of the verbs of "giving" (*opazô* ["give"] is used four times [420, 433, 438, 442]; *oninêmi* [429–436 is twice employed here out of three presences in Hesiod]) suggest a certain poverty of her own personality, a colorless routine in her behavior and impart a sort of catalogic tone to the passage.

It is also interesting that Hecate favors two different sort of social beings: from 429 to 439, she give benefits to the nobles and the language has a sort of heroic tone, while from 440 to 449 the text also mentions her negative, destructive power (443) and she is described as benefitting (together with other gods, like Poseidon and Hermes) common people. In conclusion, she seems to be a goddess for every season and for many sorts of men, but especially for the aristocrats. The extraordinary number of honors and privileges the text piles upon her do not shape a rich

⁴⁶ Zeitlin (1966) 369–370.

⁴⁷ See Edwards (1971) 52–53; West (1966) takes it as a kenning from popular speech.

personality and characterisation; in fact the exuberance of the text's praise makes more evident the real weakness of her actual power in every specific realm. The excessive use of the tag phrase: "if she wishes" seems to prepare the audience for "the uncertainty of her promises."

If Hesiod performed the *Theogony* at the funeral of king Amphidamas, as has been suggested, and if that occasion did determine the choice of arguments, perhaps we may assume that he sang the celebration of a goddess who was important for his audience. This assumption could be confirmed by the strong emphasis on the *dasmos* (423–425): Zeus, the new king, did conserve all the honors that the early king, Cronos, had bestowed on Hecate. This divine equanimity could have been delivered as a good example for the new king.

Chasm's progeny: the children of Night and Eris

Erebos and Night, the children of Chasm (123–125), are not, apart from their obscurity, bad in themselves, and their progeny, Aither and Day (*Êmerê*), are good; but Night alone has a prodigious and baneful fertility (211–225).⁴⁸ One wonders why only Night and not Day (*Êmerê* who in Greek is feminine), should, alas, have children at all. As the text lists them we understand the double nature of Night that is exemplified by her progeny as Fränkel has illustrated in this passage.⁴⁹ The children in the first group have a figural, or symbolic connection with the world of obscurity—and Night is defined accordingly as *erebennê* (obscure, 213), and her parthenogenesis is underlined (213):⁵⁰ Moros (Doom), Kêr (Death) Thanatos (Death),⁵¹ Hypnos (Sleep) the tribe of Oneiroi, (Dreams). In the second group of children, the Hesperides (215) may represent what is hidden from men, since they are placed at the extreme west, at the sunset; yet the others too have symbolic contiguity with

⁴⁸ On the children of Night, see Arrighetti (1993) 101–114, who defends the traditional order of lines 213–215, and explains the three groups of Night's children.

⁴⁹ Fränkel (1960) 317 ff.

⁵⁰ οὐ τινι κοιμηθεῖσα θεῶν τέκε Νύξ ἐρεβεννή: the epithet ἐρεβεννή recalls *Erebos* the male with whom she does not copulate in generating these new children. As Carla Costa (1968) 62 realizes, the children Night had with Erebus are clearly cosmic, as Aither and Êmerê, while the children she bore without Eros are concerned instead with the human world.

⁵¹ στυγερὸν τε Μόρον καὶ Κῆρα μέλαιναν. Notice the chiasmus and the fact that Ker is given the same epithet as her mother Night (123).

darkness as negativity: Mōmos⁵² (Blame), Oizus (Woe), Moirai (217–218),⁵³ Kêres. The last group of the children of Night—now called *Nyx oloê* (deadly Night, 224)—are “Nemesis, a misery for mortal beings” (223), Apatê (Deceit), Philotês (Love),⁵⁴ Geras (old age), and “hard-hearted Strife” (Eris). Some of these beings seem to be the personification of thoughts and speeches that are plotted and engineered in silence and obscurity of purpose.

Night’s last child, Eris, produces her own progeny (226–232), children marked by some negativity in accordance with the whole series, connected to Chasm and Night, and therefore to obscurity, emptiness, darkness, plotting in the dark. I mention here only those who are brought into play in Hesiod’s work:

Eris in the *WD* is double, good and bad; and inasmuch as she is bad, she loves inaction, laziness and frequenting the court: accordingly, she is involved in plotting and disputes.⁵⁵ Lethe (Oblivion) is a *hapax* in Homer (*Il.* 2.33), where she is negative, as she is negative in *Th.* 235–236; yet she is good in *Th.* 54 and 102. Pseudea (Lies) are certainly negative in the important passage 27–28 of the *Theogony*.

*Gaia’s progeny: the children of Pontos,
the monstrous progeny of Pontos and Gaia.*

Meanwhile Gaia’s progeny does not remain inactive, since Pontos (Sea), born from Gaia without any mate (132), himself creates, without copulation, a series of marine beings. The oldest of his sons is Nereus, whose name is probably interpreted by Hesiod from *Nê-eris* (no discord) or *Nê-reus*⁵⁶ corresponding to the Old Man of the Sea (*Il.* 18.141, *Od.* 24.58, *grandaevus Nereus* in Verg. *Georg.* 4.392).⁵⁷ The gods of the sea and of the rivers are originally gods of ordeals, of divine judgement,

⁵² In sch. *Il.* 1.5 Mōmos advises Zeus to produce Helen and accordingly a conflict between Europe and Asia.

⁵³ In lines 905–906 the *Moirai* depend on Zeus’ power: this shows how Zeus gains control even of the divinities born from Night; see Vasta (2004).

⁵⁴ For the exceptional presence of *Philotês* in this group, see Arrighetti (1993) 112. We should recall that as Uranos came to Gaia desiring intercourse (*himeirôn philotêtos*, 177) he brought with him Night (176), and that on this occasion he was castrated. See also Eur. *Hipp.* 106, where the young man says: “I like no god that is adored by night.”

⁵⁵ See Pucci (1996) 206 ff. and on the passage as a whole, Mülke (2002) 151–152.

⁵⁶ West (1966); Merkelbach (1956) 289.

⁵⁷ See among others Costa (1968) 66.

and therefore are considered to be truthful.⁵⁸ This explains the description of Nereus (233–234):

Nereus unerring and truthful ἀψευδέα καὶ ἀληθέα ... infallible and gentle νημερτής τε καὶ ἥπιος.

His relation to truth is described as the opposite of that in *Th.* 27 and the same as that of the Muses in *Th.* 28: his judgements, his words are identical to things as they are.

Nereus is the father of the Nereids of whom the text gives us a catalogue (240–264).

But now Gaia in sexual relation with Pontos begets some children, Thaumatas, Phorcys, and beautiful-cheeked Ceto, and here the traumatic unfolding of unregulated differences begins (265–336). It is not clear why the copulation of Pontos and Gaia should bring to light children who in turn produce a crowd of monsters, the Graiai, the Gorgons (including Medusa), Chrysaor, Pegasus, Geryoneus, Orthos, Echidna, Cerberus, Hydra, the Chimaera, the Sphinx, the Nemean lion, and the snake who protects the fruits of the Hesperides. A monstrous zoo! It is suggestive to think that the hybridism and gigantism that marks these beings could be ascribed to the mingling of the two opposite principles, the steadfastness of Gaia and the fluidity of the sea,⁵⁹ but Gaia does not need conjunction with her opposite in order to beget monsters: she creates Cyclopes, Giants and Hundred-Handers together with Uranos, and she begets Typhoeus with Tartarus.

It is more important to underline with Costa, Strauss Clay and others two aspects: 1) the function that this generation of monsters has in the development of the cosmic and divine world and 2) the specific nature of their ontological being. Starting from this last point, lines 295–297 describing the nature of Echidna illustrate some of her specificity:

ἡ δ' ἔτεκ' ἄλλο πέλωρον ἀμήχανον, οὐδὲν ἐοικὸς
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,
σπῆι ἐνὶ γλαφυρῷ, θείην κρατερὸφρον' Ἐχιδναν.

She bore in a hollow cave another intractable monster, not at all similar to mortal humans nor to immortal gods: divine strong-hearted Echidna ...

First of all it is not clear who begets her: many names have been provided by scholars, but none is certain. Dissemination in the primordial age of the cosmos in which these monsters come into being, is sometimes

⁵⁸ Vernant (1963) 17–18.

⁵⁹ Costa (1969) 165.

anonymous. The difference makes no difference because there is only difference and no identity.

Echidna is “another *pelôron*”: the epithet *pelôrê* is frequently applied to Gaia, and accordingly Echidna’s ancestress is promptly recalled by this adjective: yet here *pelôron* is not an epithet, but a substantivate adjective and designates an “enormous thing”, not better defined. With the next word *amêkhanon*,⁶⁰ “unmanageable”, the being of Echidna is described as an undifferentiated whole. But then the specific combination of her body follows: half beautiful nymph and half snake. The incongruous differentiation is appalling and reveals the disorder of a primordial chaos.

Yet this disorder is hard to read and hard to suppress: Echidna will truly be put in a cave by the Olympian gods,⁶¹ but as Visentin⁶² reminds us, Cecrops, a hybrid like Echidna, is the first king of Athens.

The text’s gesture toward the civilising effect of the Olympians and their children is obvious: all the monsters are either integrated and coordinated (e.g. Pegasus, Cerberos) in some way by the Olympians’ *dasmos*, or are suppressed: six of them are killed by the heroes, Heracles, Perseus, Bellerophon (see Strauss Clay [2003] 158–159). And yet the one who plots the birth of some of the monsters (Hydra and the Nemean lion) is an Olympian goddess, Hera. The danger of disorder lies close to the source of order, and it is never totally banished, notwithstanding the metaphysical desire implicit in the text. If therefore the function of the monsters’ presence in the text is that of emphasizing the Olympians’ action of banishing the primordial world of deformities and incongruous differentiations, this function is only partially realized. Chaos, injustice, the lies of the Muses, still threaten the new world.

Prometheus’ provocation

Zeus’ protections and defenses against disorders, hostilities and rivalries seem never to be sufficient: the children of Styx are permanently attached

⁶⁰ This adjective is used five times in Hesiod: three times it characterises monsters (295, 310, 836) and twice it characterises Pandora as a *dolos amêkhanos* (*Th.* 589, *WD* 83).

⁶¹ Echidna is born in a cave and she will remain in a cave under the earth, far from men, assigned to dwell there by the gods (303). By the verb *dassanto* (cf. *dasmos* in line 425) the text seeks to assure us that the Gods, i.e. the Olympians, have taken control of the world and established a hierarchical order in it and removed anomalous beings.

⁶² (1997) 210.

to him (384–388, 401–404), the Cyclopes (141, 501–506); the Hundred-Handers (618 ff.) form a cohort of valid, invincible beings, and yet there will be moments of uncertain victory and others in which Zeus is alone to defend himself and win. One of these instances is his duel against Typhoeus, another his contest with Prometheus, son of the Titan Iapetus.

The role of Prometheus in the *Theogony* is different than the one in the *Works and Days* where it directly concerns the destiny of humankind.⁶³ I shall especially underline his role as a rival of Zeus, one who as line 534 declares: “was challenging [contending] the designs of the mighty son of Cronos.”⁶⁴ He seems, therefore, to appear in the eyes of Hesiod as a contender for power, and given the sort of contest of wits in which he engages, he appears as a “provocateur” or even as a trickster who is finally baffled by Zeus.

Among the divergent interpretations given to the first encounter (Zeus is baffled by his rival, Zeus is in control, etc.) the most persuasive reading presents Zeus as surprised by Prometheus’ deception and consciously deciding to punish the human race. His reasons remain obscure, as do Prometheus’s motivations in deceiving Zeus.

Zeus immediately perceives Prometheus’ trick during the last banquet between men and gods at Mekone, and lucidly, mockingly, wonders: “My dear fellow, how unfairly you have divided up the portions!” (544). The fact that *dolos*, *technê* and crooked *mêtis* are deployed against the immortal counsels, paternal authority and the wrath of Zeus may suggest that Prometheus acts as a “figure” of that which tries to supplement nature, its immortal identity and aims at taking its place, by mere tricks, re-compositions, redistributions but no power of creation. Prometheus could represent the otherness of that identity and divine authority in the figure of “humanity”. The insistence on Zeus’ mockery and wrath is remarkable: *kholos* (wrath) and its verb appear only in this specific context, five times (533, 554, 562, 568, 615), always used to characterize Zeus’ response to Prometheus. One should add the presence of *khôomai* (561), and one realizes the fury of the supreme authority as it feels challenged by supplanting, displacing, imitating strategies.

⁶³ Even the recent bibliography on the representations of Prometheus and Pandora is vast: see Vernant (1974), (1979), Judet de la Combe (1996) 263–300; Saintillan (1996) 315–348; Vernant (1996) 381–392; Zeitlin (1996) 349–380; Blümer (2001); Strauss Clay (2003) 100–128; Pucci (2005).

⁶⁴ οὐνεκ’ ἐρίζετο βουλὰς ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι. Scholars realize that the episode presupposes that Zeus possesses his full power, that he has obtained thunder and lightning, cf. Solmsen (1949) 50 ff.; Mondì (1984) 325–344.

The way Prometheus' division (meat for one part and bones for the other)⁶⁵ would jeopardize the plans of Zeus is untold: perhaps the fact that Prometheus favored humanity contradicted Zeus' other designs;⁶⁶ at any rate, at Prometheus' provocation, Zeus immediately "saw in his [own] mind evils for human beings" and decided to choose the bones (550–557).⁶⁷ The whole passage seeks to communicate Zeus' mastery in this situation: ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι (534), the formulas πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε in 542 (cp. 580), Ζεὺς ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδώς in 545, 550, 555, 561, a formula used only in this episode, and lines 550–551 leave readers in no doubt about Zeus' control. On the opposite side, Προμηθεὺς ἀγκυλομήτης (546) connects Prometheus to the defeated Cronos, for in the *Theogony* this epithet is used only for them. No doubts can affect the reader: yet Prometheus is a strong opponent and the text must concede his talents and create suspense (e.g. 558–560).

The drama of the unfair division and the suspense of Prometheus' challenge to Zeus decline as the anthropological explanation intervenes: Prometheus' division caters to men's need for meat, and to men's nature, since meat is the decaying part of an animal, and Hesiod (556–557) sees this story as an explanation and justification of the Greek practice of sacrifice.⁶⁸ Indeed, the structure of the Greek sacrifice looks like a sort of "supplement" alluding to and unfairly taking the place of a "common and egalitarian meal" between men and gods that ought to have existed before Prometheus played his trick.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ For the text on 538 and 540, see Clay (2003) 109–112. The latest editor, Most, judiciously accepts the transmitted text with a correct explanation. For a different interpretation see Borgeaud (2004) 46–56: referring to Jean Rudhardt, he observes that the last meal at Mekone is not in itself a sacrifice, since the separation between gods and men has not yet occurred. He compares Hesiod's three dynastic successions to the myths of Crete and Arcadia, representing the beginning of royalty and the establishment of a civilized phase with the third king.

⁶⁶ In some versions, Zeus had decided to destroy the human race. For other assumptions, see Strauss Clay (2003) 108. Notice διεδάσσαι in 544: Zeus implies that Prometheus is organizing his own *dasmos*.

⁶⁷ The text strongly emphasizes the δολίη τέχνη, the deceptive craft or trickery of Prometheus by obsessively insisting on it in lines 540, 547, 555, and 560 (four of the nine occurrences of τέχνη in the *Theogony*). Gaia uses a "nasty and deceptive trick" in 160 (by producing *adamás*), and Zeus uses "craft and force" against his father (496). The strong negative coloration put on the deceptive intent of Prometheus makes him a trickster. The connection between Gaia and Prometheus suggested through δολίη τέχνη is relevant.

⁶⁸ Vernant (1974), (1979).

⁶⁹ On this point see Pucci (2005) 53–54.

Again and again the human mode of being is nothing but a corrupt, deficient image of the perfect divine being: human beauty, *logos*, meals, etc. are shadows, supplements of the corresponding divine features. The *Theogony* is the *logos* of this nostalgic restoration or recalling: the text itself, a divine discourse in a human mouth, ought to make this restoration possible.

The next match in the contest between Zeus and Prometheus produces for a short moment a sort of cosmic "hide and seek": first fire is hidden and then found again, until suddenly Zeus eludes this game by creating a woman, the first female in the cosmos, a being that emerges both as an artifact and a natural essence; a being that in the *Theogony* has no name and will be Pandora in the *Works and Days*. The text exhibits all its skill in producing the emotion of surprise and wonder at Zeus' new idea and creation: in fact, with this creation, Zeus shows his abysmal distance from Prometheus who can only devise different distributions of things, change their composition, uncover what is there and hidden; but Zeus can bring into light a new being, and with this, he restructures a whole system. The description of this new being and of her ruinous/benefiting effects takes 42 lines (570–612), during which her extraordinary beauty and wonder (*thauma*—the artistic work of the gods) is extolled four times (575, 581, 584—*thaumasia* is hapax in Hesiod—, 588). Hesiod's text rivals the gods in artistry: the formula *thauma idesthai* is used in the *Iliad* only for divinely made objects, and here the woman is in effect a divinely artistic object; the words *daidalos* (artistic), *daidala* (artistic designs) appear in Hesiod only here; the hypocoristic epithets enhancing the beauty, and the pricelessness of what adorns the woman are in enjambement at the beginning of the verses for emphasis (574, 575, 577, see also the relative clause 579–580); the rhymes emphasize the objects, 574–575; the *stephanos* is a headband often worn by the goddesses and here is artistically decorated by Hephaistos with designs of beasts that look similar to living (voice uttering) beings. The divine artistic creation therefore represents the living world in a way that makes it appear as if it were alive, speaking (583–584). This is just what the Muses declare in line 28, when they oppose their song of truth to imitative discourse. As this woman, this artistic creation, reaches the assembly of the gods and men, she shocks them. The marvel and the wonder of her beauty hides the pernicious effect of being the hinge-figure on which the whole golden age of mankind turns into the present miserable life: this beautiful evil, in place of what is good (585, 602) is a living paradox, a divine object and a fake, a turning point embracing both registers, a

“supplement”. Like the false discourse of the Muses that imitates the real things and constitutes a deceptive form of the discourse of truth, so Pandora stands as a deceptive form of that world of beauty in which gods and men had a common life before Prometheus’s trichery.⁷⁰ The bitterness with which women are described in the last part of the episode,⁷¹ through an infelicitous simile, as lazy drones (the males of the bees), while the bees exert themselves in painful work, has the sour bite of some pages of the *Works and Days* and it silences the solemnity and grandeur of the cosmic scenario. But the text refuses to close the cosmic conflict between Zeus and Prometheus with this focus on human miseries, and turns to Zeus in order to celebrate his unconquerable mind (613–616): notice *noon* (613, mind, will) that is placed in the same spot of the line as *kholon* (615, wrath), and see how Zeus’ will is implicitly identified with necessity (615–616). Heracles will free Prometheus from the torture of the eagle, but not free him from the bonds: Zeus does not pardon his challenger.

Olympians, Titans and Zeus’ last battle

The cosmic scenario regains vividness and force in the description of the epic battle between the Olympians and the Titans (630–720). Although part of its language and some military themes derive from Homer, the purpose of this description is not to compete with the poet of the *Iliad*. Too many odd and alien features characterise this narrative.⁷² To begin with, these ferocious fighters are invulnerable: notwithstanding their fury and their mightiest weapons, they can neither be wounded nor killed. They fight only to conquer the supreme power.

The description is full of sound, fire and fury: all this tumult and convulsion harms the surroundings, Gaia for instance, who “roars as

⁷⁰ This primordial woman is the figure that illustrates and explains the emergence of sexual life, family and work in human life. She is therefore the sign of human beings’ decay, although Hesiod’s representation of this fall through a process of imitation questions the very notion of this fall. For a full development of this theme, see Pucci (1977) 82–126.

⁷¹ In fact the text calls women “the race of women” (γένος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων); on this point see Loraux (1978) 43–87.

⁷² Appreciation of the style and success of this narrative varies radically among scholars: it is odd, alien, elliptic for Schoemann (1857) 93–124, but the pearl of the *Theogony* for Wilamowitz (1928b) 371. Others scholars in the nineteenth century opted to bracket it.

she is burnt" (693–695).⁷³ One of the purposes of Hesiod's narrative is therefore that of showing the turmoil, disaster and pain of the cosmic elements in consequence of the gods' brave and furious fight.⁷⁴ Another feature, alien to the Homeric epic, is that Hesiod's description reveals almost nothing about the Titans' weaponry, strategies, allies, or feelings, which are so lavishly illustrated for the Olympians. The Titans seem a phantasmal presence of which we learn nothing. And, finally, we hear nothing even about the individual Olympian gods: Zeus' *aristeia* and that of the Hundred-Handers occupy the decisive narrative of the battle.

This episode, therefore, is not intended to duplicate the Iliadic battle scenes, not even the "fights among the gods" in the *Iliad*; no, it is the space that is gloriously filled by the illustration of Zeus' two specific talents as a sovereign, his political shrewdness, and his skill in military leadership. The text reports extensively and verbatim (639–663) his successful agreement and alliance with the Hundred-Handers. They are the final agents of Zeus' victory (627 ff. and 711–720). Scholars have recognized the strength and the solemnity of Zeus' address to them (644–654).⁷⁵ His foresight in liberating the Hundred-Handers and his persuasive ability shine, since he has to confront the different genealogy of the Olympians and the Hundred-Handers (644–648 and 660).

As for Zeus' military prowess, he fills the battle with his thunder and lightnings—which he receives from the Cyclopes—and with his strategic moves. Zeus' double performance, political and military, proves that he deserves to become the sovereign of the cosmos.⁷⁶

⁷³ ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα φερέσβιος ἔσμαράγιζε/ καιομένη, λάκε δ' ἀμφὶ περὶ μεγάλ' ἄσπετος ὕλη/ ἔξεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα: "All around life-giving Gaia was roaring as she burnt, and all around the great vast forest crackled, the entire surface of the earth was boiling, and so the streams of Ocean and the barren sea." The epithet for Gaia is absent in Homer and a hapax in Hesiod: it prepares us for the total burning of her fertility in the next battle. The epithet for "forest" really means "unspeakable", emphasizing its vastness.

⁷⁴ With respect to the details, see, for instance, line 662 where the battle is designated by the phrase ἐν αἰνῇ δημοτῆτι, which in Homer often means "in the terrible slaughter"—an impossible translation in this case; in line 630 the war is called πόνον θυμάλγέ' ("the toil that brings pain to their heart"), but this epithet has hardly any relevance in the course of the description.

⁷⁵ E.g. Aly (1913).

⁷⁶ Accordingly, the battle is neither described nor experienced by the fighters as a battle between fathers and sons with its underpinning Oedipal nuances, nor between the old and the new generations: it is fought for sovereignty, see Blaise-Rousseau (1996) 214.

The balance of victorious power between Zeus and the Hundred-Handers and the precise phases of the battle (contemporaneous or successive phases of the combat in relation to Zielinski's "law") have been themes of dissension and debate.⁷⁷ Blaise and Rousseau follow Latacz's interpretation of the phases of the Iliadic war, and describe the successive moves of the battle in the *Theogony*. They write that Zeus' *aristeia* is neither a doublet of that of the Hundred-Handers, nor is it contemporaneous with it, but it occurs in the progression of the action; and they show that the structure of the Homeric model of battle-scenes is broken by the insertion of important details, for instance of signs that bespeak and underscore the theological and cosmological nature of the conflict (222–223). Finally they imply that though the Hundred-Handers are those who push the Titans into Tartarus, the main exploit is that of Zeus' *aristeia* (686 ff.). As the Titans are relegated and bound in Tartarus, it is appropriate to have a long description of Tartarus itself (721–819).⁷⁸ It is evidence of Zeus' unscrupulousness that he sends the Hundred-Handers down to Tartarus to guard the Titans (723–735).

Considered inauthentic by many scholars,⁷⁹ the description of Tartarus is striking for its new style: the genealogical principle is replaced by a topological one: here ... here ... (729, 736, etc.) with confusing juxtaposition of horizontal and vertical directions. Tartarus opens as an immense chasm (740 ff.): χάσμα μέγ', οὐδέ κε πάντα τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν/οὔδας ἵκοιτ', εἰ πρῶτα πυλέων ἔντοσθε γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ κεν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα φέροι πρὸ θύελλα θυέλλη/ἀργαλέη· δεινὸν δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, "a great void whose bottom one would not reach in a full year, once inside the gates: but one would be borne hither and thither by storms after storms, cruel ones: terrible even for the immortal gods." The nominal phrase ensures an atemporal dimension; the distance and expansion of the chasm ("void, gaping") increases disproportionately in comparison with the previous measurements (721 ff.); the double *paronomasia* rhetorically conveys the accumulation of rushing gusts, and the separated adjective at the beginning of the line, followed by pause, acquires an enormous expressive force. The passage's power to make present the horror of a confused, indiscriminate space is undeniable. This turbulent chasm harbours the house of Night, whom Hypnos

⁷⁷ See Frazer (1981) 5–9; Mondì (1986) 25–48; Schmidt (1988) 39–69; Blaise-Rousseau (1996) 213–234.

⁷⁸ A good analysis of the passage is offered by Northrup (1979) 22–36.

⁷⁹ The passage in lines 734–745 is bracketed even by West (1966).

and Thanatos accompany; here are the seats of Hades with its monstrous Cerberus (767–773), the seat of Styx, place of the icy water, punishment for the perjurer gods (775–806).⁸⁰

It seems that after Zeus' victory with a part of the cosmos under his hierarchical order, it is necessary to envision the part of the cosmos that is not under his control as an unlimited and undifferentiated space, an immense void (740 ff.) of darkness, the place of death and of imprisonment. The text builds an amazing scenario that adumbrates the immensity and the mystery of an infinite space: this scenario opens and closes the description of Tartarus (736–739 = 807–810) with different additions 740–745 and 811–814.⁸¹ The construction of order and the control of difference are never fully achieved: it is on this phantasmal world of chasm that the organized, visible world erects itself.

Indeed immediately after the representation of this dark world of indistinction, a monster emerges from Gaia to challenge Zeus, Typhoeus, the youngest son of immense/monstrous (*pelôre*) Gaia and of Tartarus (820–885).⁸² Through the battle that follows and Zeus' victory, he takes control of all the incongruous, undifferentiated and monstrous forces that are in some way embodied in Gaia, the mother of Erinyes, the Cyclopes, the Hundred-Handers etc., and now of Typhoeus.⁸³ At the same time the myth of the snake challenging the Storm-god is very old: it came from Anatolia to Greece in the course of the second millennium, as Watkins has shown.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ The profound torpor (*kôma*) that affects the immortals as they are lying on a bed “without breath”, *anapneustos*, without *nektar* and *ambrosia* has been well commented by Barra-Salzedo (2007) 86 ff.

⁸¹ Fränkel (1975) 105–107: “... Hesiod says that the boundaries and sources of all objects in being overlie the ‘empty gulf’. Formulated in our language, this means that everything in being exists by virtue of the fact that it is opposed (spatially, temporally and logically) by an empty non-being ... Hence the universe and everything in the world ‘in its order’ has boundaries at which it comes up against the ‘void’ ...”.

⁸² On this episode too the Analysts have expressed the most serious doubts: see, for instance, Solmsen (1969) 27: “to return to Typhoeus, no matter what one may think of West’s effort to make the vocabulary of this episode acceptable, the diction remains astonishingly inflated, more than once hard to construe and here and there obscure, (vv. 844–849, 859–866).” As is often the case, the Analyst throws the responsibility of a difficult or troubled text on a late “interpolator” as if a late interpolator by definition would produce such a text and would not be able to write a few lines clearly. For the defense of the passage see, besides West, Stokes (1962) 1–37; Blaise (1992) 349–370.

⁸³ Blaise (1992) 349–370.

⁸⁴ Watkins (1995) 448–459 demonstrates that in our text (just as in the *Iliad*), the form of the verb [πληγῆσιν] ἰμάσσας (*Th.* 857) preserves that of the Hittite verb although with a new meaning.

It is therefore appropriate that this old myth comes to threaten Zeus' sovereignty and to challenge him. This encounter becomes the occasion for Hesiod to represent Zeus without any allies, alone, in a individual duel with a terrifying and incongruous monster.⁸⁵

This point becomes fully dramatic in lines 853 ff., where after the two adversaries have confronted one another from afar each using his own means for throwing fire (844–846), Zeus suddenly “leaps upon him from Olympus” with his thunder and lightnings and burns all the heads of Typhoeus. It is this personal attack, this aggression far from the protected seat of huge Olympus that gives him victory. The originality and the suddenness of Zeus' strategic move is strongly underscored by the language: “Zeus heaped up his strength” (853) is an unparalleled expression (West [1966]) and gestures toward a new and decisive start, just as Zeus is described as doing on other momentous occasions (see for instance 569–570, and 687); the phrase “he grasped his weapons” (εἴλετο δ' ὄπλα, 853) is not found in epic, but ὄπλα designates “armour” only twice in the *Iliad* and only for Achilles' armour, fabricated by Hephaistos (18.614; 19.21); the choice of the word follows the Iliadic grammar. After the repetition in 854 of an Hesiodic formula (707), the text echoes parallel heroic phrases to describe Zeus' quick and decisive jump from Olympus: see analogous phrases for nimble gods like Hera in *Il.* 14.225 and Athena in *Od.* 1.102. West (1966) ironically comments: “Zeus is not usually so energetic.” True, but this jump is what allows him to strike his enemy at close quarters. In 856, Zeus' act of burning Typhon's prodigious, formidable heads (*thespesias*), emphasizes of course Zeus' prodigy. Surprisingly, the description of the fight does not end with the celebration of Zeus' victory, but with the depiction of Gaia's defeat and destruction. She is melted by a flame that is shot forth from Typhoeus' body, her son and creation (!), as he is hit by Zeus' lightning. In the terms of the conflict we have described, it is revealing that Zeus, by defeating this monster of unnatural, incongruous difference, defeats simultaneously Gaia's prodigious fertility and extraordinary creativity. Gaia's body is first evoked by the dark rugged “mountain's glens”—those mountains she had created by differentiating herself—where Typhoeus' body lies, and then it is evoked in the simile with tin and iron, as iron is

⁸⁵ “The birth of Typhoeus gives Zeus an opportunity to demonstrate his individual prowess by defeating in single-handed combat a terrifying adversary and thereby to prove himself worthy of supremacy and rule.” Cf. Most (2006) xxxiii.

said to be melted in the “mountain’s glens” by Hephaistos’ skilfull hands. (Those hands had decorated Pandora, 580–581). Metals are parts of Gaia’s body and therefore the simile is ambiguous: it is literally her body that is melting, not only like tin and iron, but inasmuch as tin and iron. The text suggests also a reflexive glance (a sort of ring-composition effect) between *teke* (“Gaia bore”, 821) and *(e)teketo* of lines 862, 867 (“Gaia melted”), as if the two actions had to mirror one another, and the melting was just the melting of her powers of fertility. With the last line of the episode (868), the text returns to Zeus who hurls Typhoeus “into broad Tartarus, grieving him in his heart” (*thymôî akakhôn*).

Of the four elements that are the essential parts of the cosmic whole and that are affected by the Titanomachy and by this last battle (840 ff.), only Gaia remains a victim of the violence. Through the simile, Gaia is reduced to something (a metal) that falls under men’s control and becomes subject to men’s dealings.⁸⁶

Gaia is now presumably barren, and accordingly no longer able to threaten anyone through her fertility. This might explain why she accepts Zeus’ rule, and indeed why she tries to defend it (881–885, and 891–893). And yet, as soon as Zeus has swallowed Metis, Gaia also ceases to be a useful adviser, since Metis, being now inside Zeus, can take on Gaia’s role.⁸⁷ Notice that it is Gaia herself that advises Zeus in this way (891–900).

As a result, the disseminating power of Gaia’s fertility, her congruous and incongruous creativity cease to enrich and threaten the development of the cosmic world, cease to challenge the unitary and hierarchical constitution of the divine cosmos. That the agent in this suppression

⁸⁶ Editors and translators spell Gaia (and all the other cosmic elements like Pontos etc.) with a capital letter when some expression of activity (bearing, speaking etc.) characterises them as individual persons, and with a lower-case letter when these elements appear as natural phenomena. However we should then translate the Greek terms as “earth” and not *gaia*. Yet, this confusion aside, the distinction that we make by typographical means is inconsistent with the Greek conception. In the religious experience of the Greeks, as Brelich (1985) 53 explains, no difference was felt between a thing (such as the earth or the sun) and the divine personality that was ascribed to it. However, since we have to use this discriminating typographical means, we are forced to distinguish what the Greeks felt to be undifferentiated. As the reader realizes, I have consistently used the capital letters for Gaia, Pontos, Uranos etc., but it is sometimes difficult to be consistent: see for instance *Th.* 571, where Hephaistos uses “earth” (*gaiês*) to shape a semblance of a girl.

⁸⁷ On the probable presence of the Metis episode in the Derveni Papyrus, see Betegh (2004) 113 and 162 ff.

of Gaia is a male god, and that the female goddess is in some way an accomplice in her own suppression testifies to the specific cultural-social order and ideology of archaic Greece.

Whereas this gender issue unfolds clearly and explicitly in the treatment of Pandora, it is not textually underscored for Gaia. Language emphasizes, by means of expressions like *amêkhanon*, *pelôrê* and *dolia tekhnê*, Gaia's unmanageable fertility, the lack of devices to stop her and her creations, the magnitude and the monstrosity of some of her productions and the terrible resourcefulness of her deceits. This ceaseless spreading of herself in offspring of all sorts and natures is what we have called her power of difference and differentiation.

The new order

The text of the *Theogony*, in the manuscript tradition, reaches line 1022, but scholars have been skeptical of the authenticity of the whole or at least of large sections of the final portion. They have identified its style and content with those of the subsequent *Catalogue of Women* whose Hesiodic authorship was until recently denied or doubted. Thus West, for instance, thinks that the genuine text goes no further than 900, while Aly and Jacoby take it to 929, others to 962, and still others to 964.⁸⁸ Yet more recent criticism has in some way changed the nature of the debate both by questioning the validity and the absoluteness of stylistical analysis as evidence of authenticity, and by suspending the skepticism surrounding the *Catalogue of Women*.⁸⁹

There is no doubt, as West forcefully argues, that from around line 900 the style and the poetic thrust change: the composition becomes eminently catalogic, without the opening of narratives, the tone is sedate, without surprises, the language less inventive, etc., but all these features could depend on a less violent, less new set of arguments: the dynasty of Zeus and of his sons and daughters is known, Zeus' reign is certain and sure, and the coming into being of goddesses of justice, kindness, peace, and legitimacy (901–904), of the Graces, the Muses ("who delight in festivals and the joy of song", 907–917), creates an atmosphere in which

⁸⁸ See the complete list and bibliography in West (1966) 398.

⁸⁹ Edwards (1971) 198–199; Janko (1982) 221–224; Strauss Clay (2003) 28–29, and the long defence in Arrighetti (1998) 368–373 with bibliography.

everything occurs peacefully with everyone's agreement, most often *en philotêti* (twelve times in lines 923–1018, as compared to only eight times in all the previous lines).

These benevolent deities shift the divine action and the readers' attention from the cosmic scene toward the human one: Dike, Themis, Eirene, the Muses etc. have greater significance for human life than for the gods' balance of power under Zeus' sovereignty. While in the *Works and Days* the power of these deities is often shown to be frail or nonexistent, here in the *Theogony* they make a beautiful allegorical show of Zeus' regime.⁹⁰

Zeus becomes king (*basileus*) of the gods (again under Gaia's impulsion)—a title that he never has in Homer—and divides the honours "well" among the gods (883–885).⁹¹ But what does "well" mean? Whereas some interpreters lend full confidence to Zeus' wisdom,⁹² others remain perplexed and lament the barren, poor and brief description of the system of gods in Hesiod.⁹³

Besides, by swallowing Metis, Zeus certainly deprived her—the one who "among the gods and the human beings knows the most" (887)—of her honours; and furthermore he deprived Athena of her mother, taking upon himself a sort of monstrous pregnancy (924–926), and appropriating the female function of procreation. This sort of parthenogenesis recalls Pontus' begetting of Nereus (*Th.* 233) and "constitutes a drawback to one of the earlier phases of cosmic evolution."⁹⁴

The new, stable order under the kingship of Zeus still needs trickiness, duplicity (*apatê*) and seductive, deceitful words (*aimulioisi logoisin*) to survive, as Zeus uses these strategies to put Metis in his own belly (889–890). In this way, he prevents another god from obtaining his royal power (892–893), since a victorious rival is destined to be born from Metis. The stable order needs to inflect and bend what is predestined,

⁹⁰ The mothers of these deities are often from the older generations (Themis and Mnemosyne are Titans [135], Eurynome is daughter of the Titan Oceanos, etc); by this marital policy, many scholars underscore Zeus' integration of the old gods into Olympus. See Bonnafé (1985) 87–102; Ramnoux (1987) 155–164; Miralles (1993) 17–44.

⁹¹ On this *dasmos*, and on the different procedure among the gods in Homer, see Janko (1992) 247; Lanza (2005) 19.

⁹² Wismann (1996) 21 produces a confident image of Zeus who establishes the identity of his power in the very heart of the differences (i.e. the division and the balance of honours), a balance that constitutes the justice of Zeus. Wismann recalls Hecate, however, with the image of "seduction and uncertainty of the promise" [l'incertitude et la seduction de la promesse]—and the injustice of banishing the Titans.

⁹³ See e.g. Fränkel (1962) 107.

⁹⁴ Strauss Clay (2003) 28 n. 46.

a very difficult task. Apparently, therefore, the danger of a new sedition against the unified, univocal order is still present and menacing. If the Olympian pantheon is still a place of fraud and chicanery how can we be sure about the truth of the Muses' song? The Muses themselves may not be able to sing that song that is identical to truth (28), and may be inclined to speak with the same deceptive words Zeus uses to overcome the danger of being replaced by a son. They do not like their "servants" (926) and often cheat them (27). Furthermore, in this perfect order, Hera in fury and quarrelling with her husband, gives birth, without any sexual intercourse, to famous Hephaistos, who, as we have seen all through the poem, is the most endowed with skills among the Uranian (celestial) gods (927–929). Did Hera imitate Zeus? Notwithstanding Gaia's lost autonomy and powers, difference, instability, imitation still wriggle in the univocal world of the Olympians. New gods may appear and trouble the order. These are shadows, fears that menace the great family of Zeus of which the Muses sing the final victory. Let us then listen to them.

Now the whole pantheon unfolds before our eyes, the glorious, rich, manifold structure of Greek polytheism with its great strengths and weaknesses. The final lines of the *Theogony* in its manuscript tradition relate the loves of the goddesses with the heroes: the closing verses mention Odysseus' affairs with Circe and Calypso (1011–1018), and thus the poem closes with a gesture toward a sequel of adventures that promise rich narratives, unending excitement, yet at the same time it arouses a feeling of nostalgia for the infinitely spreading cosmos of immense Gaia, starry Uranos, and *mêtietà* Zeus.

WORKS AND DAYS: TRACING THE PATH TO ARETE*

JENNY STRAUSS CLAY

At first glance, the *Works and Days* offers a bewildering farrago of materials: mythological narratives, fables, allegories, a calendar of agricultural chores, proverbial adages, some apparently autobiographical tidbits about Hesiod, his brother, and father, religious prohibitions, and finally a list of lucky and unlucky days. Certain passages, especially the story of Prometheus and Pandora and the Myth of the Races, are justly famous and widely studied—often without attention to their contexts—but others like the “Days” and the religious prohibitions have been either ignored or athetized. How—or whether—these disparate materials fit together and whether there is any rime or reason to their ordering has been the central focus of scholarly debate.¹ A second area of discussion has centered on the question of genre: what is the relation of the *Works and Days* to other kinds of early Greek hexameter *epos*, especially the heroic epics of Homer,² as well as to Hesiod’s own *Theogony*?

The *Erga* becomes the model for subsequent didactic poetry, and many scholars have considered it a Hesiodic innovation, a personal statement occasioned by his quarrel with his brother Perses and his passionate commitment to preach the gospel of work and justice.³ Its disjointed presentation is thus ascribed to Hesiod’s wrestling—with limited success—with novel and intractable material. But some recent critics have argued for the traditional character of the *Works and Days*, citing parallels from the “Wisdom Literature” found in many ancient societies and even within the Greek poetic tradition in the *Theognidea* and the paraenetic speeches of Homeric epic.⁴ Some sections of the poem, like the agricultural calen-

* This chapter constitutes an updated synthesis of Clay (2003), which contains a fuller discussion and bibliography, and (2007). Its somewhat dogmatic character is due to limitations of space. I have also not dealt with the social and economic implications of the *Erga*, for which see Tandy and Neale (1996) and Edwards (2004); also Millet (1984).

¹ For a recent and very thorough overview of Hesiodic scholarship, see Manakidou (2006) 257–279; also Blümer (2001) 7–22.

² See Tsagalis, this volume.

³ E.g. Fränkel, (1962) 104–106; Arrighetti (1975); and Stein (1990) 6–54. For refutations of the biographical approach, see Griffith (1983); and Stoddard (2004) 15–33.

⁴ Cf. West (1978) 3–25 and (1997) 306–331 for Near Eastern parallels; and Martin (1984) for Greek ones.

dar and the strings of *gnomai* and even elements of the poem's dramatic occasion and certain facets of Hesiod's self-representation, may indeed be traditional features of a pre-existent genre of advice poetry.⁵

Unlike the *Theogony* where Hesiod depended on the Muses for his knowledge of matters divine, remote from the ken of ordinary mortals, in the *Works and Days* Hesiod's theme focuses on the human sphere: how human beings should live and behave toward each other and the gods, and how they can prosper within the limits established by the laws of Zeus.⁶ In the *Theogony* Hesiod traced his authority to speak from the Muses, but finessed the issue of their truthfulness; in the *Works and Days*, however, he asserts not only his personal authority to hold forth on matters of concern to mankind, but he also affirms the validity of his assertions. With his authoritative voice he alternately threatens and cajoles, promises and instructs, commands and exhorts not only Perses, but also the kings.⁷ Moreover, he deploys a vast panoply of rhetorical tropes and strategies—fables, allegories, myths, and proverbs—as he develops his case for work and justice and also reveals the way the world works, the *etetuma*, “things as they are”.

The *Works and Days* falls roughly into nine sections: invocation (1–10); the two Erides (11–41); Prometheus, Pandora, and her jar (47–105); the five races (106–201); justice (202–285); precepts, maxims, and proverbs (286–380); work on land and sea (381–693); precepts and prohibitions (694–764); and the Days (765–828). Whether this ordering should be construed as a number of fairly independent blocks loosely linked through an association of ideas or arranged in a scheme of ring composition or organized according to some overarching architecture has occupied generations of scholars.⁸ The puzzling design of the *Works and Days* can, I believe, best be understood as a dramatic monologue by following the course of Hesiod's argument in a linear fashion as it unfolds and is absorbed by Perses and, to a lesser extent, the kings. In addition, the changing faces of Zeus must be mapped over the course of the poem; for the role that Hesiod ascribes to Zeus modulates from the watchful guardian of justice invoked in the proem to a more distant and

⁵ Cf. Martin (1992); Nagy (1990b) 47–82; also Lamberton (1988) 1–37.

⁶ See Clay (2003) for a detailed comparison of the two poems and an argument for their complementarity; also Masaracchia (1961).

⁷ I translate *basileis* throughout as “kings,” although their role in Hesiod corresponds more closely to judges or arbitrators.

⁸ See for example Hamilton (1989) 47–87; Bona Quaglia (1973); Beye (1972); Nicolai (1964); Verdenius (1962); Kerschenshteiner (1944) 149–191; and Fuss (1910).

inscrutable figure. To grasp Hesiod's teaching concerning the *etetuma* means tracing this dual trajectory. As the audience, we too are involved in the dynamic movement of Hesiod's protreptic, both as observers of Perses' gradual conversion and of Zeus' transformations, and increasingly, after both the kings and Perses have vanished from the poem, as addressees.

Beginning with a brief but rhetorically complex ten line proem,⁹ Hesiod invokes the Muses to come from Pieria "to celebrate their father in song" (ἀοιδῆσι κλείουσai, 1), but their song differs from their hymns in the *Theogony*; here they celebrate Zeus not for his supremacy over the other gods, but instead for his power over mankind: it is *through* (*dia* with a pun on the accusative of Zeus, *Dia*) him that men have good or bad reputations and become famous or infamous (ὄν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε, / ῥήτοί τ' ἄροητοί τε Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι, 3–4).¹⁰ Significantly, Zeus does not grant *kleos*, which is usually in the purview of the Muses (cf. line 1) and the domain of heroic epic; the *Works and Days* are decidedly post-heroic. Yet the concern with both good and bad speech, a central theme of the poem, is established right from the start. Human repute in turn depends on Zeus' power, which he exerts "with ease, to grant strength or weaken the strong, to diminish the great and raise up the obscure" (5–6); that power turns out to have an ethical and even punitive dimension ("easily he straightens the crooked and blasts the proud," 7) that Hesiod will elaborate in the first part of his poem. Duly emphasizing the distance separating gods and men, the Muses conclude their celebration of their father with the phrase: "high-thundering Zeus, who inhabits the most exalted halls" (Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει, 8). Now the poet abruptly turns away from the goddesses to address Zeus directly with a fairly brusque prayer: "hearken, watching and listening and, you for your part, make straight the decrees with justice" (κλυθι ἰδὼν αἰὼν τε, δίκη δ' ἴθυνε θέμιστας / τύνη, 9–10). Zeus is to observe and exercise his corrective, i.e., punitive, power over those who promulgate crooked decrees, that is, the kings. Meanwhile, Hesiod states his intention: to declare to Perses the way things are (ἐγὼ δέ κε

⁹ Cf. Calame (1996) 169–185; Rousseau (1996); also Race (1992) 32; Massa Positano (1971); Livrea (1966); and Clay (2003) 49–80 for a comparison with the *Theogony* proem.

¹⁰ I translate: "disreputable and reputable, talked about and unspeakable;" but cf. Mancini (1986).

Πέρση ἐτήτυμα μῆθησαίμην, 10).¹¹ The proem thus indicates a cooperative venture involving a division of labor that will structure the following composition.

Hesiod launches into his task with an apparent “correction” of his own *Theogony*’s teaching about *Eris* (Strife), thus both linking and distinguishing this work from his earlier one and bringing out the difference between the divine and human perspectives of the respective poems. On earth, it turns out that there are not one but two Erides, of which one is destructive, but her elder sister, placed in the roots of the earth by Zeus, goads men to work and compete with their fellows. Now addressed directly for the first time, Perses is to ponder this teaching and, restraining his indulgence in the evil *Eris*, to embrace her older sister, who, however, remains unlovely, inspiring men to envy and to rage against their neighbors’ prosperity, and a symptom of a fallen world in which scarcity reigns.¹² *Eris* can only be turned into a positive force if the competitive drive is tempered by justice. The doubling—or splitting—of *Eris* is but the first example of Hesiodic *Begriffsspaltung*, whereby one and the same concept may have a positive and negative side.¹³ In fact, such ambiguity characterizes the human condition.

Whether Perses is real or fictional, whether he is portrayed in a consistent fashion, and the precise details of the brothers’ falling out has long preoccupied scholars; but for our purposes, Hesiod tells us what we need to know.¹⁴ Perses himself turns out to be not so much an inconsistent as an evolving persona in the course of apprehending his brother’s teachings.¹⁵ As for the *mise-en-scène* of the dispute, we hear that the brothers had divided their inheritance, but this division did not satisfy Perses, whose name means “wastrel”. But by slinking around the *agora*, engag-

¹¹ For the marked character of μῆθησαίμην, see Martin (1989); for the distinction between *alethea* and *etetuma*, see Cole (1983); and Krischer (1965).

¹² On *Eris*, see Gagarin (1990); Nagler (1992); Mezzadri (1989); and Munding (1960). Blümer (2001) 2. 42–49 dislikes the unloveliness of the good *Eris* so much that he ejects lines 25–26!

¹³ Cf. Martinazzoli (1946) and Livrea (1967). Manakidou (2006b) sees the duality of Hesiod’s cosmos as the key to the structure of the *Erga*, but can it account for its linear progression?

¹⁴ For various scenarios, see, in addition to the commentaries, Latimer, (1930); van Groningen, (1957); Gagarin (1974); Lenz (1975); and Schmidt (1986) 21–28. Kirchhoff (1889) believed that lines 11–281 contained five separate songs concerning the brothers’ court case. But cf. Jones (1984) 315; Green, (1984) 25; and Blümer (2001) 2. 16, who reject the notion of a lawsuit.

¹⁵ On the supposed inconsistencies, see West (1978) 36–40; but cf. Schmidt (1986) 27–28.

ing in shady deals, picking quarrels, committing perjury, and suborning the judges, he has managed to squander what he had and to impoverish himself to boot. The “gift-eating” kings for their part have been all too eager to collaborate with Perses’ nefarious schemes by accepting bribes and passing crooked judgements (27–41). The crimes of both Perses and the kings involve the misuse of speech; the proper response to their abuse of language will be Hesiod’s just speech, the *Works and Days* itself.

Hesiod urges his brother to “resolve their quarrel on the spot with straight judgements which from Zeus are the best” (ἀλλ’ αὖθι διακρινώμεθα νεῖκος / ἰθύνῃσι δίκῃς, αἶ τ’ ἐκ Διὸς εἰσιν ἄρισται, 35–36). Here Hesiod arrogates to himself the prerogatives of the kings who, as we learned in the proem to the *Theogony*, are under the tutelage of Zeus. But the king whom the Muses honor receives the gift of eloquence¹⁶ that permits him to resolve disputes peacefully (*Th.* 84–85):

οἱ δέ νυ λαοὶ
πάντες ἐς αὐτὸν ὁρῶσι διακρίνοντα θέμιστας
ἰθύνῃσι δίκῃσιν· ὁ δ’ ἀσφαλῆως ἀγορεύων
αἰψά τι καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσε.

The people all
regard him as he discerns the ordinances
with straight judgements; and he, speaking without stumbling,
quickly and expertly makes an end, even to a big quarrel.

In their encounter on Helikon, the Muses had granted Hesiod not only divine song but a scepter of laurel (*Th.* 30–32); however, only in the *Works and Days* does its full significance emerge. For here, Hesiod exercises the royal prerogative whose emblem unites the authority of Zeus with Apollo’s sacred tree. Since the gift-eating kings have been corrupted and have abdicated their responsibilities, Hesiod must take justice into his own hands. It is he, rather than the kings, that will τήνδε δίκην δικάσσαι (“pronounce judgement on the present case,” 39).¹⁷ Both the kings and

¹⁶ For Hesiod’s extension of the Muses’ domain from poetry to persuasive speech, see Solmsen (1954). Also Puelma (1972) and Stoddard (2004) 176–188.

¹⁷ See Calame (2005) 45. Verdenius (1985a) *ad loc.* suggests: “the kind of judgement as is known here.” On the meaning of *dike*, Gagarin (1973) claims it always refers to a legal case. Contra: Claus (1977); and Dickie (1978). The Scholia at 279a (Pertusi) note that *dike* has several meanings in Hesiod: ποτὲ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς σωματοειδοῦς θεᾶς, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαίου, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς κρίσεως, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς τιμωρίας (“sometimes the personified goddess, sometimes justice, sometimes judgement, and sometimes punishment”).

Perses are pronounced *nepioi*, fools in need of instruction; the vacuum of authority and rectitude obliges Hesiod to appropriate royal authority and rhetoric and to wield the scepter.¹⁸

Introduced by the explanatory γάρ, the Prometheus story that follows explains the human imperative to work and the origin of the countless invisible and unpredictable evils that beset human life (42–105). Both are the results of Zeus' intentions and are henceforth inescapable for mankind (105). Vernant has shown how the Prometheus myth, recounted in both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, characterizes the ambiguities of the human condition poised precariously between god and beast through the institution of sacrifice, agriculture and marriage.¹⁹ The version presented in the *Erga* offers a textbook case of the manipulation of myth to suit its context, audience, and purpose. For in the *Theogony*, the story demonstrates Zeus' cunning and supremacy over all other gods, while in the *Works and Days* it focuses on the human need to work and the other miseries of human existence.²⁰ The confrontation between Zeus and Prometheus so prominent in the *Theogony* recedes as the focus shifts to the actions of Zeus and their impact on human beings. "For the gods hid and keep hidden sustenance" (*biotos*, 42). The first act of the story, Prometheus' attempt to deceive Zeus with the sacrifice trick, is thus omitted because the *Erga* already presupposes the separation of gods and men that was the consequence of Prometheus' deception. But Hesiod here elaborates the end of the myth: the fabrication of Pandora and its consequences, the account of the *pithos*, the escape of the evils that beset human beings in accordance with Zeus' plan, and Hope's place on the lips of the jar.²¹

The story told in the *Works and Days* is explicitly predicated on an earlier state when men lived without evils or suffering and diseases (90–92), and one day's work by even a lazy man sufficed for a year (43–46). It begins with Zeus' hiding fire and Prometheus' theft. As revenge for the theft of fire, Zeus plots baneful woes for human beings (53–59). Men will retain fire, but Pandora, a substitute for fire (ἀντὶ πυρός, 57), who is coeval with the hiding of *bios*, ensures their misery. Fabricated

¹⁸ Cf. *Il.* 2.183–332 where Odysseus snatches up the ancestral scepter of Agamemnon to quell the unruly Greeks. See also Laks (1996) 91.

¹⁹ Vernant (1974) and (1979).

²⁰ For a detailed comparison of the two versions, see Clay (2003) 104–128; also Judet de la Combe (1996); and Judet de la Combe and Lernould (1996).

²¹ For Pandora, see especially Zeitlin (1996); Calabrese de Feo (1995); Loraux (1978); and Pucci (1977) 82–126.

by all the gods as a gift to mankind, Pandora's name, promising all but all-consuming, ironically usurps and subverts the epithet of the all-giving Earth, who has ceased from her abundance. The blushing bride, the original gift horse, is welcomed into Epimetheus' house, despite his brother's warnings (83–89). Henceforth wives and children must be fed, and men must coax their sustenance from the earth through unrelenting labor. In contrast to the anonymous robot-like woman of the *Theogony*, Pandora possesses not only an exterior that resembles a respectable maiden, but also an invisible interior; her seductive effect on men arises not only from her beauty, but also from her voice and her speech that beguiles and deceives. Men will henceforth willingly embrace the great bane of their existence, realizing only afterwards the inescapable trap they have taken to their bosom. As her double, Pandora's *pithos* possesses the same seductive but deceptive promise she herself embodies. Made of the identical materials as she, the receptacle of foodstuffs, *bios* itself, the jar promises to sustain life, but within contains only life-destroying ills of every kind.

There is probably no greater controversy in Hesiod than the meaning of Hope who remains in the jar.²² The central issue in my opinion is not whether Hope is negative or positive, since *elpis* in Greek means “expectation” of either future good or bad. Like Strife or Shame, Hope is double and unique to the human condition. The real counterpart to Hope is certain knowledge of what will be, a knowledge unavailable to mankind.²³ Hope who remains within the jar under its lips (ὑπὸ χεῖλεσιν, 97) corresponds to Pandora's seductive voice that utters lies and wheedling words, revealing her swindling character.²⁴ But we need both their seductive promise and illusion. Once the earth bore fruit generously and of her own accord (*automate*, 118); now it is the diseases who bring suffering day and night that are *automatoi* (103); we, however, are ignorant of when or where they will strike since Zeus, who gave

²² Thanks to E.F. Beall for an up-to-date survey (*per litteras*); Musäus (2004) 13–30 also reviews proposed solutions. Cf. West (1978) 169–170; and Leinecks (1984). Also Beall (1989); Komornicka (1990); Ogden (1996) (for an odd solution); and Lauriola (2000). Musäus (2004) 30–41, drawing on Neitzel (1976) argues that the *pithos* contains grain that Pandora scatters; cf. Krajczynski and Rösler (2006). For some delightful representations, see Neils (2005).

²³ Cf. Plato, *Laws* 644c who defines Hope as δόξα μελόντων, “opinion about future events,” that comprehends both fear of future pain and confidence in future happiness. Cf. also Theognis 1135–1136 and *Prometheus Bound* 248–250.

²⁴ Cf. Penelope's ploy: πάντας μὲν ἔλπει, καὶ ὑπίσχεται ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστω, / ἀγγελίας προῖεῖσα· νόος δὲ οἱ ἄλλα μενοινᾷ (*Od.* 2.91–92).

Pandora her voice, has taken theirs away. Zeus' silencing of the countless evils the flesh is heir to (104) parallels Pandora's replacing the cover of the jar "by the plans of aegis-bearing Zeus" (99) and thus ensures Hope's continual presence under its lip. For Hope would be unnecessary if human miseries announced their arrival; on the other hand, human life would be unendurable if we had precise knowledge of the hour and manner of our death. Even Hesiod can only nurture the *hope* that Zeus will not destroy mankind (273). Only Hope makes mortality bearable.

Hesiod now offers to outline an alternative account (*heteros logos*, 106), which likewise presents a decline from a happier state, but whose emphasis is on the second great theme of his poem: the need for justice. Interpretations of Hesiod's account of the five races have looked to Near Eastern and Indo-European parallels, but comparisons only throw into relief their divergences from the story he tells: the heroic race must be regarded as an awkward insertion arresting the pattern of decline; moreover, the silver and bronze races, while different, do not seem to represent an obvious decline.²⁵

An influential structuralist reading posits the alternation of *hybris* and *dike*; the golden and heroic races symbolize the reign of *dike*, whereas both the silver and the bronze are marked by *hybris*.²⁶ Moreover, the succession of races is not viewed as linear but cyclical, so that a new golden or heroic race would follow the iron.²⁷ But Hesiod's apocalyptic warnings and vision of the final destruction of our race of iron would fall on deaf ears if a rosy future lies ahead. Nor does such an interpretation take account either of the function or the narrative logic of Hesiod's tale.²⁸ It reveals, moreover, a misunderstanding of Hesiod's conception of *Dike* (Justice), so central to his teaching, due perhaps to the influence of later poets, especially Aratus. For the moralizing Aratus (*Phaen.* 100–114) the presence of Justice among men constitutes the hallmark of the golden race, but he "deliberately disagrees with Hesiod in allowing agriculture to be one of the activities of the Golden Age."²⁹ But as the *Works and Days*

²⁵ See West (1978) 172–175; and (1997) 312–319; Gatz (1967) 7–27; Koenen (1994). Most (1997) and Ballabriga (1998) 333–334 argue for Hesiodic innovation.

²⁶ Vernant (1990) and (1985) 43–60; also Goldschmidt (1950). Most recently, Ready (2007).

²⁷ Cf. Mezzadri (1988) 51–57; and Carrière (1986) 228–229; also Martin (1942–1943) 62–71.

²⁸ See my critique (2003) 81–85; also Calame (2006) 88–91.

²⁹ Kidd (1997) *ad* 112; also Schiesaro (1996).

attests, agriculture and justice go hand in hand. It is only with the loss of a primal abundance that competition for increasingly scarce foodstuffs arises, a competition that without the restraints imposed by justice would acknowledge only the law of the jungle.

In Hesiod's version of the races, human beings are fabricated by the gods, products of art rather than of a natural genealogical process.³⁰ The races are, however, coordinated with the divine succession outlined in the *Theogony*; while both the golden and the silver races were manufactured during the reign of Cronos, the latter is destroyed by Zeus, who has evidently come to power in the meantime and who subsequently manufactures both the bronze men and the heroes. The races are—with one exception—radically discontinuous, each requiring a fresh intervention on the part of the gods. Making involves purpose—just as the making of Pandora did. Which raises the question: if the gods' first attempt was so perfect, why was there a need for a second? And what was the flaw in the golden race that the far inferior silver race attempted to rectify? And, for that matter, in the subsequent races?

The repeated trails and errors of the gods' experiments helps us to understand the rationale behind the gods' creation of mankind and likewise makes apparent the interest of the gods in establishing a certain relation between themselves and human beings, which in turn has important bearings on the larger themes of the *Erga*. Although mortal, the golden men (and apparently, there were only males), exempt from aging and toil, were perhaps too similar to the gods to constitute a distinctive—and inferior—species, and they lacked the means to reproduce themselves. Nevertheless, after death, they become *daimones* and guardians of men on the earth, “by the will of great Zeus.” We will meet them again in Hesiod's diatribe against the kings (252–255).³¹

Despite the fact that the race of silver is “much worse” and “in no way like the golden in their looks or thought,” (χρυσέω οὔτε φυὴν ἐναλίγκιον οὔτε νόημα, 129),³² it nevertheless represents a certain progress; for it is clear from these big babies who spend a century clinging to their mothers that sexual reproduction has been introduced and that human life has become subject to the temporal cycle of youth and age from

³⁰ See especially Benardete (1967) 156–159; Rudhardt (1981) 245–281; Sorel (1982) 24–30; and most recently Calame (2006).

³¹ The switch to the present tense at 122–125 and the mention of Zeus' agency suggests (even without the suspect verse 124) that these *daimones* will form part of Zeus' dispensation.

³² *Phue* implies natural growth.

which the golden men were exempt. But this experiment will require some fine-tuning, since the excessively infantile silver people have only the shortest prime, which they devote to violence; and out of sheer stupidity (ἄφροαδίας, 134), they refuse to worship or sacrifice to the gods. Hesiod's negative formulation points to what the gods expect from men: the sense to recognize and honor their divine superiors. Zeus, now in power, destroys the big babies of the silver race, yet they live on under the earth as "blessed mortals," who I have argued are ghosts and poltergeists, those nameless creatures that go bump in the night. They too will have a role in Zeus' dispensation.³³

Now in charge, Zeus makes the violent race of bronze men, "in no wise like the silver ones" (144). The weakness of the silver race is overcome, but overdone; these brutal and monstrous human beings, who lack agriculture but possess the art of metallurgy and thus can make brazen houses and weapons, mutually annihilate themselves and end up "nameless" in Hades. No need, apparently, for divine intervention. But the mention of agriculture suggests that the toil it demands will provide a means to curb human aggression. Zeus' second try is far superior to his first as he creates the race of heroes, a divine race, both "better and more just" than their predecessors. Only here do we get a hint as to how this race "who are called half-gods" was made: through divine intercourse with mortals. Much like ourselves, these heroes live in cities, sail the seas, and know what justice is. Human violence is by no means abolished, but it is mitigated by both agriculture and justice. Unlike the men of bronze, neither they nor their wars vanish namelessly as the allusions to heroic poetry involving Thebes and the Trojan War demonstrate. Some of the heroes die as we do, but others are transported to the earth's boundaries in the Isles of the Blest and enjoy eternal spring and an abundance that resembles the golden age.³⁴

The fifth and final race of iron is introduced not in the cataloguing style of the previous races, but with Hesiod's passionate outburst (174–175):

Μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ὄφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι
ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ πρόσθε θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι.

Would that I were not a member of the fifth men,
but had died before or was born after.

³³ Clay (2003) 89–90.

³⁴ See West (1978) *ad loc.* on lines 173a–e. Some believe that all the heroes were translated to the Blessed Isles, but that is improbable.

In some quarters, Hesiod's wish has been misinterpreted as an allusion to a cyclic scheme whereby the golden or heroic age would return after the destruction of the iron.³⁵ But this cannot be: the whole paraenetic purpose of the poem would be vitiated: Why change your ways if in any case better times are coming? The iron race also stands apart because it was not fabricated like the others; it stands in direct descent from the heroes after the gods distanced themselves from mankind. Thus Hesiod can speak of the heroes as the "previous generation."³⁶

The Iron Age has two phases: one bad and the other worse. However difficult things may be now, nevertheless good is still mixed with evils. Still to come is an apocalyptic vision of the future, when the bad *Eris* reigns supreme, where every kind of violence and injustice will not only be tolerated, but honored, and only might makes right. Respect for kin, parents, and gods will be trampled under foot while perjury and harsh as well as crooked speech will triumph until Shame and Righteous Indignation (*Aidos* and *Nemesis*) depart. Zeus will destroy this race when children emerge grey-haired from the womb.³⁷ Yet Hesiod's horrendous vision of the future, although an extrapolation from the present, is not inevitable: the world stands at the crossroads, and only Hesiod's teaching can prevent the final catastrophe.

Hesiod's first three lessons, *Eris*, Prometheus, and the five races, have different messages, but in all three Zeus is the architect of the human condition. While the Prometheus story is addressed to both Perses and the kings (*nepioi*), the other two are apparently directed at Perses alone. Although Hesiod began by stating his intention to resolve his dispute with Perses, the parties he must bring into harmony are not merely himself and his brother; since Perses' crimes have depended on the collusion of the kings, he must also break their unholy partnership. But in addition to an indictment of their past wrongdoing, Hesiod must convince both that justice, which seems to go against one's self-interest, is profitable and persuade Perses that work, which is inherently unpleasant, will be rewarded. The complex form and arrangement of Hesiod's

³⁵ See above, n. 24 and 25.

³⁶ Cf. Calame (2006) 110.

³⁷ Cf. Falkner (1989), who interprets the different races as representing a sequence of the infancy (silver), adolescence (bronze), prime (the heroes), and the old age of mankind (iron). Attractive as this view is, it suggests a natural continuity between the races that only exists for the last two.

composition is dictated by the multiplicity of his arguments for work and justice as Hesiod tailors his advice to his addressees.³⁸

With an abrupt $\nu\upsilon\nu\ \delta'$ (203), Hesiods divides his addressees, first taking aim at the kings by deploying a genre that demands their active participation to decipher its message;³⁹ they must recognize themselves in the fable of the hawk and the nightingale. Caught in the talons of the hawk, the nightingale (*aedon*) piteously bemoans her fate, but the hawk responds brutally: even though she may be a fine singer (*aoidos*), he will do whatever he wants with her, even eat her up if it suits him.⁴⁰ The fable's apparent message is that in a bird-eat-bird world, speech, even the just speech of Hesiod, like the poor nightingale, is powerless against brute force. While singer may compete with singer (26), the singer on her own cannot take on the kings; she will need reinforcements. Turning brusquely to Perses, Hesiod, in a series of bold personifications (213–224), now adopts the voice of Justice herself: Perses must listen to Justice and stop currying favor with *Hybris* who weighs down the lowly (like Perses) as well as the noble and causes them both to meet with Disasters. Justice, now personified, first runs a race with *Hybris*, which she will win in the end, but her rape by the gift-eating kings who pass dishonest decrees causes public outrage. Weeping she departs planning punishment for those who abuse her. A diptych then juxtaposes the blessings enjoyed by the just city with the sundry disasters that befall the unjust one (225–247). Indeed, even one man's wickedness may bring down divine punishment on the whole city. Zeus in his punitive role, we note, is far more visible in the unjust city than in the just one. This argument may mean different things for Perses and the kings, but it suggests that the promotion of justice is in both their interests.

Leaving Perses to ponder whether his past activities abetting the crooked kings were truly advantageous, Hesiod for the first time addresses the kings directly, this time not with riddles, but with thunderous three-fold threats (248–269): Zeus' 30,000 guardians (the post-mortem spirits of the golden race) observe their injustice; and Justice, whom we left weeping, now denounces the unjust to her father Zeus so that the

³⁸ Cf. Schmidt (1986).

³⁹ Note, however, the lack of direct address, which only comes later (248).

⁴⁰ Bonnafé (1983) points to the parallels between the nightingale and the subsequent description of Justice outraged. For recent "revisionist" interpretations of the fable, see Perysinakis (1986); Nelson (1998) 77–78 and (1997–1998); Leclerc (1992); Lonsdale (1989); and Hubbard (1996).

community may pay for the kings' crooked dealings. They cannot escape since the eye of Zeus himself observes what kind of justice they dispense.

Returning now to Perses, Hesiod finally explicates his earlier fable to the kings. It turns out to be based on a false premise: unlike the beasts, human beings are not allowed to eat each other, nor does might make right, for Zeus has granted them justice, whose practice is rewarded and whose violation is punished. Hesiod concludes his argument to that "great fool Perses" with the allegory of the two paths: the broad easy highway to vice and the other (289–292):

τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροισεν ἔθηκαν
ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν
καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὶν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
ῥηιδίη δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ εὐοῦσα.

But before the path of virtue the immortal gods have set sweat;
The path to her is long and steep
and rough at first; but when you reach the top,
thereafter, it becomes easy, even though difficult.

With the great protreptic toward justice now winding down, we must assume that both the kings and Perses have been won over by Hesiod's royal rhetoric and straight judgements. Neither kings nor cities will be mentioned again in the poem.

At this critical juncture, before tackling the second prong of his argument, Hesiod allows himself a self-referential statement (293–297):

Οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος, ὃς αὐτῷ πάντα νοήσει
φρασσάμενος τὰ κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ἦσιν ἀμείνων·
ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ κακῆϊνος ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται·
ὃς δέ κε μήτ' αὐτῷ νοέῃ μήτ' ἄλλου ἀκούων
ἐν θυμῷ βάλληται, ὃ δ' αὖτ' ἀχρήμιος ἀνήρ.

Altogether best is he who can think things through on his own,
considering what may happen and how it will turn out in the end;
Worthy too is the man who is persuaded by one who gives good advice;
But the one who can neither think for himself, nor take to heart
what he hears from another, is useless.

The *panaristos* who can figure things out on his own—and therefore can instruct and command others—is none other than Hesiod himself. Perses' status on the other hand is not yet fully realized; further lessons await him, but the signs are hopeful (298–299):

ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἡμετέρης μεμνημένος αἰὲν ἐφετμῆς
ἐργάζεο, Πέρση, δῖον γένος.

But you, being always mindful of our commands
work, Perses, scion of Zeus.⁴¹

Between lines 213 and 285, words containing the root DIK occur no less than 27 times. Only afterward does Hesiod take up the theme of work and agricultural work in particular. Echoes of the poem's opening and Perses' circumstances punctuate the transition to a new phase of Hesiod's argument, and wealth as the reward for work makes an emphatic return (22, cf. 313, 377, 381). This section with its precepts, *gnomai*, and exhortations both recapitulates the theme of justice and foreshadows the motif of work and simultaneously makes clear why Hesiod positions the argument for work after the case for justice, a decision that has a profound impact on the whole design of his poem. Perses cannot be sent back to the farm to work the land before he has learned that taking from another by word or deed is wrong and subject to punishment. Justice involves and defines the entire community, but one can labor alone or in the restricted framework of the *oikos*.⁴² Now assumed to be cured of his dishonest ways, Perses must learn that the only sure means to success and prosperity approved by both men and gods resides in work. The key words here become *metrios* and *horaaios*, "measured" and "timely", which are applicable not only to work, but also to all human interactions and relations with the divine. For Perses the alternative to work is no longer quarrels in the *agora*, but starvation (394–404).

If the poem's first half concentrated on justice within the *polis*, its second half presents a narrowing of perspective, focusing on the *oikos*, the family farm, and neighbors rather than on the larger community. In the almanac of the farmer's year, seasonable work correctly done holds out the prospect of success (383–617). The natural world, the rising and setting of the stars, the song of the cuckoo, swallow, and cicada, provide signals for the activity appropriate to each part of the yearly cycle.⁴³ The farmer's almanac takes up one third of the composition, but provides no practical manual for farming, nor is it simply metaphorical, but it provides lessons applicable to a broad range of human issues. Moreover, Hesiod views agriculture as the defining activity of post-Promethean

⁴¹ Both Hesiod and Perses are momentarily elevated: ἐφετμή is often used of divine commands, while δῖον γένος has heroic overtones.

⁴² Consider, for instance, Laertes in the *Odyssey*.

⁴³ For the calendar and its structure, see Nelson (1998), especially 44–58; Riedinger (1992); and Marsilio (2000) 15–41.

man, not only necessary for sustaining life, but also the sole mode of acquisition that does not involve illegitimate gain. Farming, however, is only part of his message.

While beginning and ending with the critical fall plowing and sowing and generally following the yearly cycle, on closer examination, the calendar nevertheless frequently interrupts the orderly catalogue of seasonal chores by anxious glances both forward to the hopes and fears for the anticipated harvest and backward to the preparations required before undertaking each task. In fact, right at the beginning, Hesiod backtracks a month to give a list of all the chores—wood-cutting, the making of tools, plows and wagon, choosing the proper oxen and farmhand—that must be completed before the fall plowing can even begin (414–447). He thus creates a sense of breathless urgency during the busy periods of the year and emphasizes the farmer's dependence on the imperatives of time. After the fall sowing, one should pray to Zeus Chthonios and Demeter. Success or failure turn out not to depend solely on human effort, which Hesiod had earlier assured Perses would lead to prosperity, but on the weather sent by Zeus (416, 488, 626, 676). Poverty it will turn out also comes from Zeus (638, 717–718). No longer invoked as the guarantor of justice, Zeus has become a more distant figure whose intentions are impenetrable.

Periods of intensive labor alternate with seasons of enforced inactivity during the cold of winter and the heat of mid-summer.⁴⁴ In the extended description of winter, the bitter weather and the suffering of the exposed beasts frame the vignette of the maiden bathing and napping indoors, who is contrasted to the shivering octopus in his fireless house. Likewise, the crushing and parching summer heat dictates a respite from toil and allows shady feasting on meat and wine. Two contrasting images punctuate these scenes of enforced repose: the pampered girl still innocent of sex (519–523), and randy women rendered lubricious during the dog days while men become dried and shriveled (586). Both vignettes suggest the complexity of the relations between human beings and nature. The first depicts the human capacity to fabricate a defense (ἔϋμμα) against the cold by sewing together the hides of beasts and to protect even the most vulnerable member of the family in the face of a hostile natural environment. The marriageable maiden is valued and protected because she will become a means of uniting one *oikos* with another.⁴⁵ In the latter

⁴⁴ For the pendulations in the description of the farmer's year, see Manakidou (2006b) 160–162.

⁴⁵ Lévêque (1988) 52.

image, nature affects male and female in opposite ways, so that the sexes are eternally out of synch. These two images of the female, the one positive in that it binds human society together and ensures its continuity, the other, the source of perennial tension between the sexes, remind us of the ambiguities of Pandora, that necessary evil of human life.

Suddenly, Hesiod cuts short his pleasant mid-summer feast and backtracks a whole month to the critical time of threshing and storing the year's grain, the culmination of the process that began with fall plowing (597–608). A wise teacher, Hesiod recognizes the propensities of Perses, so easily distracted from the imperatives of work. The watchword, repeatedly hammered into Perses' thick skull, has been timeliness, timely preparations, timely reading of the appropriate signs, and timely completion of chores.⁴⁶

With some reluctance, Hesiod appends to the farmer's calendar, a section on sailing (618–693), introducing the subject in disparaging terms: "If a yearning for rude sailing seizes you" (εἰ δέ σε ναυτιλῆς δυσπεμφέλου ἔμερος αἰρεῖ, 618).⁴⁷ That desire appears literally untimely, since it takes possession of Perses, big fool that he is (633), just when the season for navigation has come to a close (619–630). The promise of quick profits that sea-faring offers, or perhaps debt and hunger, may propel him.⁴⁸ Neither the golden age nor the just city (236–237) had need of sea faring where risks to life and limb outweigh possible gains; only a pauper or a gambler would risk his life on the sea. Such, Hesiod declares, was their father, who took to sea driven by poverty; but even he eventually settled in Askra—despite its general wretchedness—and, apparently, worked hard enough to leave behind an inheritance (κλῆρος, 37) for his two sons to divide.

Hesiod agrees to give his stupid brother sailing lessons even while confessing his ignorance of navigation: he has only crossed the 50 meters between Euboeia and Aulis, where the Greeks once assembled their expedition against Troy.⁴⁹ There at Chalkis, he won a prize at the funeral games for Amphidamas—presumably with his *Theogony*—and dedicated a tripod to the Muses on Helikon "where they first initiated me into song"—a

⁴⁶ ὥραϊος, ὥρη and ὥριον occur no less than 16 times in this section.

⁴⁷ δυσπεμφέλος occurs again at 722 to describe surly behavior at a feast; in Homer, it is also used of the sea.

⁴⁸ κέρδος (632 and 644; cf. 323 and 352) always has a negative connotation in Hesiod.

⁴⁹ For the allusion to heroic epic and a metaphoric interpretation of the sailing passage, see Tsagalis, this volume; Clay (2003); and Rosen (1990).

clear allusion to the *Theogony* proem. Hesiod attributes to the Muses his ability to instruct Perses in the art of navigation and to reveal “the mind of Zeus.” Like Phemius, the bard in Odysseus’ palace, who claims to be self-taught, but also that a god implanted all manner of song in his heart (αὐτοδίδακτος δ’ εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἶμας / παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, *Od.* 22.347–348), Hesiod postulates a dual source for his poetic authority both as a *panaristos*, who can think for himself, and as disciple of the Muses. We might consider how Hesiod’s *etetuma* relate to the “mind of Zeus.”

Be that as it may, Hesiod clearly recommends navigation only as a *supplement* to agricultural work, not as a substitute. For this reason he reserves his special distaste for spring sailing (682–683) when the harvest must be brought in; if you have none, your situation must indeed be desperate. Summer sailing, however, interferes only with the summer lull and feasting, although one must be sure to rush home in time for the *vendages* and autumnal rains (674). But Perses, by nature a gambler, prefers a quick fix to steady application. His various quarrels and litigations constituted nothing more than bad gambles, which he lost. Throughout the navigational calendar, Hesiod has taken pains to underline the dangers and risks. In moving from land to sea, we palpably progress from the more certain to the less. Zeus twice appears as rain (626) and as the source of penury (638) and shipwreck (668).

The *Works and Days* continues for nearly 200 lines, but after the sailing calendar the name of Perses disappears from our text and with him the theme of work. Hesiod addresses his teaching only to an anonymous “you.” It has been suggested that Perses’ disappearance signals a shift from the specific occasion of the poem (whether real or fictive) to a more general public.⁵⁰ Yet the poem has contained general verities throughout that are not tied to Perses’ specific circumstances, and this reading overlooks the dramatic character of Hesiod’s composition and the dynamics of Perses’ education. In the course of his protreptic, Hesiod has presumably won over his feckless brother first to the pursuit of justice and second to the doctrine of labor. We can now imagine him back on his farm working his paternal land and staying out of trouble. Yet right at the beginning, Hesiod had promised to expound *etetuma*, the way things really are. Throughout his work, Hesiod has given subtle indications of these realities, but the role of chance in human life—or is it the gods or

⁵⁰ Cf. e.g. Calame (1996) 181; Schmidt (1986) 56–57.

Zeus?—increases toward the end of the poem.⁵¹ Perses, simpleton that he is, cannot apprehend such realities and still practice hard work and justice. At best, he can assimilate Hesiod's explicit counsel and become, if not an ἐσθλός, at least a decent member of the human community. The grimmer truths—that the practice of justice may not always be rewarded and that even hard work may come to naught—are reserved not for Perses, but for Hesiod's ideal listener, ὁ πανάριστος, who like the poet himself is "man who can think for himself and sees how things will turn out in the end."⁵²

If the poem's first peak asserted Hesiod's authority to speak, its second peak occurs in the "autobiographical" discursus where Hesiod describes his poetic victory at Chalcis and the dedication of his prize tripod to the Muses of Helicon (654–659). From those heights, a precipitous descent to the depiction of human vulnerability at the poem's close.

A comparison of the two gnomic passages that flank the calendars (327–382, 706–764) brings out the progressive darkening of vision. Many of the precepts in the latter section actually contradict the advice given earlier; in one case, neighbors are better than relatives (345); and neither a friend nor a brother are to be trusted (370–371); later on, however, we are instructed not to treat a friend as equal to a brother (707). The ties of blood rather than friendship bind. While the principles of reciprocity and even generosity in human interactions dominated the earlier series,⁵³ the latter group is characterized by a kind of negative reciprocity and avoidance. Moreover, in the earlier set of prohibitions against abusing guests, parents and orphans, Hesiod had warned of strict retribution from Zeus for specific unjust deeds that could be avoided (333–334), but the second group concentrates on various religious taboos involving natural physical functions whose infraction incurs vague and nameless punitive measures (724–756).

While formerly the gods were to be worshiped "to the best of one's ability" (336), now they have become far more demanding. At the same time, the focus narrows even further to the human body, now truly viewed as a mere belly producing waste products and defilement; and the "godlike man who has good sense" (731) is no longer the man who

⁵¹ Cf. Benardete (1967) 166; and Gagarin (1990) 177–178 and 181: "The surface message is essentially the 'ethical' lesson, 'follow certain rules and you will achieve prosperity'; but the sub-text is a new, more complex lesson of ambiguity and arbitrariness."

⁵² Translation Athanassakis (1983) 74.

⁵³ Cf. Millett (1984) 96–103.

tills the soil and practices justice, but the man who hides his nakedness and urinates sitting down. The most one can hope for is the avoidance of defilement and disaster in the face of mysterious and hostile forces beyond man's control or comprehension. Tellingly, Zeus appears only once in this section (724); otherwise only nameless gods and the "blessed ones" (*makares*, 730) to whom the nights belong. Finally, the whole section culminates in the birth of a new divinity, *Pheme*, perhaps to be translated as *Rumor* (760–764):

ὦδ' ἔρδειν· δεινὴν δὲ βροτῶν ὑπαλεύεο φήμην·
 φήμη γάρ τε κακὴ πέλεται κούφη μὲν αἰεῖραι
 ῥεῖα μάλ', ἀργαλήν δὲ φέρειν, χαλεπὴ δ' ἀποθέσθαι.
 φήμη δ' οὐ τις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἦντινα πολλοὶ
 λαοὶ φημίξουσιν· θεός νύ τις ἔστι καὶ αὐτή.

Do as follows: avoid the dread gossip of mortals;
 for Gossip is bad, and arises nimbly
 with great ease; but she's hard to bear, and difficult to get rid of.
 Rumor never wholly perishes, whenever many
 people spread rumors; now she too is a god.

This goddess has a purely human origin, and unlike *Eris* she does not appear to have a good sister, at least not in the present age.⁵⁴ Despite the implications of the proem, among human beings it turns out to be better to keep one's head down and be *aphatoi*, "unspoken of."

From the yearly cycle of the seasons with their appropriate signs and labors, Hesiod proceeds to the more limited and less predictable compass of the month with the catalogue of the Days, which many have long considered inauthentic.⁵⁵ But the "Days" offer a climactic demonstration of a theme that has increasingly resonated in the latter third of the poem: the decrease in human certainty and a corresponding increase in the precariousness of human existence. The days "from Zeus" that can be identified for good or ill leave one third of the month unaccounted for and unknown. Hesiod's calculations thus precisely quantify the uncertainty of all human endeavors.

The overall trajectory of Hesiod's composition can now be summarized as follows: an ascent (the argument for *Dike*) culminating in Hes-

⁵⁴ Bakker (2002) sees *pheme* as the anti- or negative *kleos*.

⁵⁵ Wilamowitz (1928b) ends the poem at line 760; cf. also Fränkel (1962) 124, 143–144; Solmsen (1963); and Samuel (1966). West (1978) 346–350 sets out the problems but argues for genuineness, as does Schwabl (1970) 468–470; and Pellizer (1975) 169–182. Lardinois (1998) shows how the "Days" cohere with themes found elsewhere in the poem.

iod's self-representation as the *panaristos*, followed by a gradual descent (the argument for work), interrupted by a second peak (Hesiod's poetic victory at Chalcis) before the final and definitive decline. While the *Theogony* presents a positive progression of the generations of the gods leading to the establishment of Zeus' eternal rule and a stabilized cosmos, the *Works and Days* involves more complex modulations. Its progressive constriction reveals itself temporally in the movement from the defining epochs of human history, in the myths of Prometheus and the races of mankind, to the cycle of the year with its predictable seasons and constellations to the individual days of the month with their obscure and ominous significance.⁵⁶ Spatially too there is a narrowing of horizons from the city to the *oikos* to the human body viewed from its lowliest physiological needs, which brings the work to a close on a far more pessimistic note and completes the program announced in the proem: to relate *etetta*, the way things really are. It ends with a modest *envoi* in a minor key (826–828):

εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος, ὃς τάδε πάντα
εἰδὼς ἐργάζεται ἀντίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν,
ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων.

Fortunate and happy is he who having learned
all these things sets about his work, blameless in the eyes of the immortals,
discerning the omens⁵⁷ and avoiding transgressions.

⁵⁶ Cf. Leclerc (1994).

⁵⁷ See West (1978) on 828 for a possible continuation of the "Days" with an *Ornithomanteia*. If so, such bird omens would fit in with the growing obscurity of the *Erga*.

THE HESIODIC CORPUS*

ETTORE CINGANO

What we know ... about the early fate of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is not much, and even that rests largely on reconstructions and conjectures some of which are more probable than others. But this small body of attractive hypotheses begins to look impressive when we compare it with the state of our knowledge about the corresponding phases of Hesiod's poems

Solmsen (1982) 1.

The sentence quoted above allows us to start from the association between Homer and Hesiod in antiquity, leaving aside the thorny problem of their chronology, unrelated to the scope of this paper. Although it was a well known fact that Homer and Hesiod had many predecessors, amongst whom were the legendary Orpheus, Musaeus, and Linus, they soon acquired the reputation of being the founders (or by far the most authoritative representatives) of the epic genre. As a consequence, a tradition developed purporting they had been rivals (thus implying they were contemporaries) and had competed in contests held in different places, in compliance with their status of wandering *aidoi*. The *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (*Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*), a prose treatise dating in its present form from the 2nd cent. AD, but stemming from the *Mouseion* of Alcidamas (early 4th cent. BC) and originating even earlier,¹ is the most detailed source narrating the confrontation between the different trends impersonated by the two poets. The *Certamen* ends with the victory assigned to Hesiod by the king who had presided over the contest, a decision much disputed by the audience: Homer's excellence as a poet

* The Hesiodic fragments are quoted according to the edition of Merkelbach-West 1967, updated in Solmsen-Merkelbach-West (1990³); the testimonia are quoted according to the numbering of Most (2006), whose collection is based on Jacoby (1930). Translation of the fragments and testimonia is taken from Most (2006) (2007). Since the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* are the object of separate chapters of this volume, in this chapter I shall deal with them only insofar as they are relevant to the corpus of Hesiodic poetry. Unless strictly necessary, I also refrain from putting the adjective Hesiodic between quotation marks throughout this chapter to indicate doubtful authorship.

¹ See West (1967); Richardson (1981) 1–3; Graziosi (2001) 168–180.

is praised throughout the treatise, but he is ultimately defeated because Hesiod's poetry is wiser and more socially useful than a poetry centered on battle and slaughter. The contest between the two major *aoidoi* of antiquity has a parallel in a pseudo-Hesiodic fragment (fr. dub. 357) where Hesiod recalls his encounter with Homer at Delos, presumably in a rhapsodic contest, thus contradicting the statement in the *Works and Days* (654–662) that the only journey he ever made by sea was the crossing of the narrow strait separating Euboea from Boeotia.² By associating the two bards with the same event, both fr. 357 and the *Certamen* elaborate upon the victory in the funeral games for Amphidamas at Chalcis in Euboea, recalled by Hesiod in the *Works and Days* (above), where no mention of Homer occurs.³ The close connection perceived in antiquity between the two major epic poets is also justified by the poetical output attributed to both: the history of the Hesiodic corpus can therefore be better understood if confronted with the history of the Homeric corpus.

Until at least the end of the 6th century, and more controversially in later times, Homer was unanimously believed to be the author not just of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but of a vast array of poems now lost, either dealing with heroic subject matters or displaying a lighter, parodic tone. A heterogeneous group of sources, starting in the 6th/5th century with the lyric poet Simonides (fr. 564 Page), was willing to credit Homer alternately with the composition of the whole epic cycle (notably of the *Thebaid* and the *Epigoni*, the *Cypria*, the *Aethiopis*, the *Little Iliad*, the *Returns*), of the *Funeral Games for Pelias*, the *Capture of Oechalia*, the *Phocais*, the *Hymns*, and of a group of 'fun poems' (*paignia*) such as the *Margites*, the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* (*Batrachomyomachia*), the *Battle of Spiders* (*Arachnomachia*), the *Battle of Cranes* (*Geranomachia*), the *Battle*

² Hes. fr. dub. 357, quoted by Philochorus, *FGrHist* 328 F 212: ἐν Δήλῳι τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἀοιδοὶ/μέλπομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδίην,/ Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορον, ὃν τέκε Λητώ. "In Delos then for the first time Homer and I, bards, /sang, stitching together our song with new hymns, /of Phoebus Apollo with his golden sword, whom Leto bore". Apart from the arbitrary synchronization of Homer and Hesiod, to my knowledge, the only possibility for accepting fr. 357 as genuinely Hesiodic would be to assume that it refers to a period later than the composition of *WD* 654–662, when Hesiod finally ventured as far as Delos by ship.

³ Cf. *Works and Days* 657–658 with *Certamen*, 13 West: Ἡσίοδος Μούσαις Ἑλικωνίσι τόνδ' ἀνέθηκεν/ὕμνῳ νικήσας ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον. "Hesiod dedicated this [a tripod] to the Muses of Helicon, /having defeated in song at Chalcis the godly Homer". Similarly to the *Works and Days*, no mention of Homer occurs in the passage by Pausanias quoted below.

of *Starlings* (*Psaromachia*), *Epikichlides*, the *Cercopes*, *Heptapaktike* (or *Ethiepaktos*, or *Iamboi*), along with various *Epithalamia* and epigrams, among which was the *Kaminos* or *Kerameis* (*Potters*).⁴

Information on the poetical output of Hesiod is less extended, but the list of poems he was said to have composed is no less voluminous and the range of subjects he dealt with equally impressive. The two main sources that complement each other in listing most of the works attributed to him in antiquity are the traveler Pausanias (2nd cent. AD) and the entry 'Hesiod' in the Byzantine lexicon *Suda* (10th cent. AD), which draws on a 6th cent. work by Hesychius of Miletus. Towards the end of his lengthy description of Mount Helicon in Boeotia, in an intriguing passage worth quoting in its entirety, Pausanias recalls that:

The Boeotians who live around Helicon say that of the poems commonly ascribed to him Hesiod composed nothing but the *Works*. And from this poem they remove the proem to the Muses, saying that it begins with the lines about the Strifes. And where the fountain is they showed me a lead tablet, very much damaged by the passage of time. On it was written the *Works*. But there is another opinion, different from the first one, according to which Hesiod composed a very great number of epic poems: the poem about women; and what they call the *Great Ehoiai*; the *Theogony*; the poem about the seer Melampous; the one about Theseus' descent into Hades together with Peirithous; and the *Precepts of Chiron* (the ones for teaching Achilles); and everything that follows after the *Works and Days*. These latter also say that Hesiod was taught the mantic art by the Acharnanians; and in fact there is a poem on soothsaying (*mantika*), which we too have read, and explanations of prodigies. (Paus. 9.31.4–5 = Hes. T 42)⁵

In the passage above, the minimalist view on his poetical output maintained by the Boeotians living on the Helicon may reflect the persistence of an early, local reception of Hesiod as a one-sided poet dealing mainly with topics related to his rural background, as opposed to his later recognition as a panHellenic poet. The entry in the *Suda* (η 583, II 592 Adler) is vague regarding the number and titles of the poems composed by Hesiod, but well informed on the length of the *Catalogue of Women*: "His poems are the following: *Theogony*; *Works and Days*; *Shield*; *Catalogue of Women Heroines* in 5 books; *Dirge* (*Epikedeion*) for a certain Batrachus, his beloved; *On the Idaean Dactyls*; and many others". If we add five more poems whose titles are preserved by other sources, such as the

⁴ See *Certamen*, 15 West; *Vita Homeri pseudoherodotea* 24 W.; *Suda* ο 251, III 524.27 Adler.

⁵ On the alphabetical order and omissions in the list mentioned by Pausanias see Leo (1894) 4–5.

Great Works (*Megala Erga*), the *Aegimius*, the *Astronomy*, (Athen. 8.364B; 11.303B, 491B) the *Wedding of Ceyx* (schol. Ap. Rh. 1.1289 W.) and the *Potters* (*Kerameis*: Pollux. *Lex.* 10.85), and bring into the picture other pieces of information concerning the titles of the poems attributed to Hesiod, we obtain the following complete list: *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, *Shield*, *Catalogue of Women* (*Ehoiai*), *Great Ehoiai*, *Melampodia*, *Aegimius*, *Wedding of Ceyx*, *Katabasis of Theseus and Peirithous*, *Precepts of Chiron*, *Great Works*, *Astronomy*, *Bird Omens* (*Ornithomanteia*), *Idaeon Dactyls*, a *Dirge* for *Batrachus*, *Potters* (*Kerameis*). Interestingly, the list thus formed matches the number of 16 poems attributed to Hesiod by Tzetzes (T 43),⁶ who unfortunately names only the first four poems here-above mentioned and omits the titles of “all the others”;⁷ but the agreement with Tzetzes on the number of poems is more likely to be fortuitous than a result of his accurate survey of the ancient sources.⁸ I have omitted the *Mantika* and the *Explanations of prodigies* mentioned by Pausanias (above), since he does not explicitly assign these two poems to Hesiod, and the titles are dubious; the so called *Circuit of the earth* (Γῆς περίοδος) quoted by Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70 F 42) is very likely to refer to a section in the third book of the *Catalogue* (cf. fr. 150–151) rather than to a separate poem by Hesiod.

A few points in common appear at first sight in the lists of works of the two poets: both are credited with the composition of the *Potters*, but Homer stands as the likelier candidate in this (false) attribution, since it is embedded in the narrative context of the well documented *Vita Homeri pseudoherodotea* (32 West; see also *Suda* s.v. Ὀμηρος), whereas Hesiodic authorship, maintained by some as Pollux specifies (= fr. 302), probably originated from the double occurrence of the word *kerameus* at *WD* 25. Moreover, both Homer and Hesiod are assigned the composition of a poem addressed to boys with amorous overtones (Homer’s *Epikichlides* and Hesiod’s *Dirge* for the otherwise unknown *Batrachus*), perhaps with

⁶ The list of poems and the section of the *Prolegomena* to the *Works and Days* of Hesiod (p. 8 Gaisford) commonly attributed to Proclus (= T 43) is in point of fact the work of J. Tzetzes, as demonstrated by Cardin (2009).

⁷ The title *Heroogony* mentioned there as another poem by Hesiod originates from a misunderstanding by Tzetzes, and the same applies to the attribution by Tzetzes of an Epithalamion for Peleus and Thetis (*Prol.* in Lycophr. *Alex.*, II 4.12 Sch.: see Marckscheffel [1840] 104–105; Cardin [2009]); Homer too was credited with *Epithalamia* by Hesychius of Miletus (= *Suda* ο 251).

⁸ On the number of poems see Marckscheffel (1840) 87–89; Jacoby (1928) 113, apparatus at l. 19; Schwartz (1960) 13–15.

the aim of making each of them the creator of yet another poetic genre, the Μοῦσα παιδική, as suggested by the specification in the *Suda* that Batrachos was the *eromenos* of Hesiod, a fact likely to originate either from a biography of the poet or from a gross misunderstanding of a text now lost.⁹

Along with the analogies hitherto outlined, a striking contrast emerges pertaining to the history of the text of the two corpuses.¹⁰ Apart from the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*, only a small number of quotation fragments and paraphrases has survived from all the poems attributed to Homer in antiquity, and the papyrus fragments are virtually non-existent, with the exception of a few scraps from the *Margites* (fr. 7–9 West = 9–11 Gostoli). On the contrary, apart from many quotation fragments and paraphrases, a large amount of papyrus fragments of Hesiodic poems has been recovered, many of substantial length, attesting to the circulation and appreciation of the Hesiodic corpus in Egypt as late as the 4th cent. AD. Such a remarkable difference in the fate of the poems must be due to different reasons: among them, one could single out the fact that Homeric authorship of many poems was considered more dubious than Hesiodic authorship: the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had long been recognised an autonomous status, and the other ‘Homeric’ poems probably underwent a more thorough criticism from Alexandrian scholarship, in the attempt to definitely mark out the ‘real Homer’ from the cyclic poets. On the other hand, a mass of epic poems dealing with didactic, genealogical, scientific and antiquarian topics is likely to have circulated anonymously; in relation to subject matter and to the pan-Hellenic status reached by Hesiod already in the 5th century, part of it was clustered under his name, with little competition from other candidates. Furthermore, while Hesiodic poetry enjoyed the appreciation and ‘imitation’ of the Hellenistic poets, at some point epic heroic narrative other than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* fell out of favour and was replaced by mythological compendia of different sorts. The severe judgement of Aristotle on the cyclic poems relating to matters of style and structure (*Poet.* 1459a31–b7) may have contributed to their neglect, and was later reinvigorated by the scathing epigrams of Callimachus (28 Pf.) and Pollianus (*AP* 11.130). All things

⁹ Cf. Schmid-Stählin (1929) 286 n. 1. One cannot help remarking the peculiarity of a dirge (in elegiac meter?) associated with erotic motifs.

¹⁰ A point made by Wilamowitz (1928) 5: on the lack of papyrus fragments of the cyclic poems see below, on the *Katabasis of Theseus*.

considered, in the course of time epic genealogical narrative seems to have better resisted the competition from prose treatises dealing with the same subjects.¹¹

Other differences between the Homeric and the Hesiodic corpus are worth pointing out. To begin with, with the exception of the *Catalogue of Women* which, being in 5 books, may have totalled 5,000 lines or more, and (if it was an independent poem: see below, p. 118 ff.) of the *Great Ehoiai*, the extension of most Homeric poems exceeds by far that of the Hesiodic ones. The only other poem of some length in the Hesiodic corpus must have been the *Melampodia* in at least 3 books (cf. fr. 277); the *Aegimius* was in at least two books (cf. fr. 296, 300).¹² On the other hand, the *Cypria* were in 11 books, the *Aethiopis* and *Nostoi* in 5, the *Thebais* and *Epigoni* numbered 7,000 lines each, the *Oedipodia* 6,600, thus reflecting the outstanding difference in length between the two 'genuine' works of each poet: the monumental length of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (more than 15,600 and 12,000 lines respectively) creates a sharp contrast with the reduced scale of both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* (1022 and 828 lines). This divergence is related to their differences in matters of content and purpose: Homeric heroic poetry was meant mainly for the entertainment of the audience and was structured on a sequence of deeds and events with chronological coherence, requiring a more extended narrative and a larger scale, no matter how loose the plot was. Although the *Theogony*, the *Works and Days*, and the rest of the corpus are fully integrated within the multifarious streams of the epic genre, their gist can better be identified as catalogic-genealogic and wisdom poetry rather than heroic, and it was generically appreciated as 'didactic' by the Hellenistic scholars and poets; starting with Hesiod and throughout antiquity, poems centered on genealogies, agricultural lore, farming techniques, moral teaching, and religious and scientific matters are of a limited length.¹³ The differences between heroic and genealogic-catalogic epic were noticed by the Alexandrian grammarians: Aristarchus contrasted the catalogue style of Hesiod with the narrative

¹¹ Conversely, Aristotle can be credited for the late interest in the *Margites* attested by the few papyrus fragments recovered, since he believed the poem to be by Homer (*Poet.* 1448b24).

¹² No information is found in the ancient sources on the number of books of the other poems of the corpus. The length of the *Catalogue of Women* is thought to have ranged between 6,000/7,000 (Schwartz [1960] 618–621) and 3,000 lines (West [1978] 78 and n. 2).

¹³ See Toohey (1996) 2–5.

style of Homer.¹⁴ It is an obvious fact, however, that Hesiod was just as well acquainted with the lore of heroic poetry, as is proved (leaving aside the *Catalogue of Women*, whose authorship is disputed) by a passage in the *Works and Days* (161–165) where he recalls the events narrated in the Theban epics and in the Trojan epics as the cause which brought about the end of the generation of the heroes.

Moreover, as mentioned above, the sources transmitting the titles of the poems show that the authorship of many poems of the Homeric corpus was often disputed between Homer and one or more competitors from different places of the Eastern Greek world (such as Stasinus of Cyprus, Hegesinus of Salamis, Cyprias of Halicarnassus, Arctinus of Miletus, Lesches of Pyrrha, Agias of Troezen), while throughout antiquity controversy over the poems of the Hesiodic corpus has rather centered on denying or asserting the authorship of Hesiod, with only one claimant, the shadowy Cercops of Miletus, emerging as the alternative author of the *Aegimius* (Athen. 11.503D = T 79). To this it may be added that, while the historicity of Homer was little questioned in antiquity, if at all (whereas his place of birth was a constant matter of dispute), scholars now tend to believe that his persona was a creation of the Homeridai, a guild of professional bards based on the island of Chios, who boasted direct descent from Homer, and gained legitimization and prestige from the authority of the founder. Similarly the guild of the Creophylidai was located at Samos, which claimed descent from Creophylus of Samos, a rhapsode who composed the *Capture of Oechalia* relating one of the many deeds of Heracles. Stories claiming that some poems were either appropriated by others (Thestorides of Phocaea: the *Little Iliad* and the *Phocais*), or offered by Homer to other rhapsodes as a dowry for his daughter's marriage (Stasinus and the *Cypria*), or in exchange of hospitality (Creophylus and the *Capture of Oechalia*), may reflect the dispute over his poetic heritage between competing rhapsodic guilds.¹⁵ Information allowing us to imagine how the text of the poems began to circulate can be gathered from the existence of the Homeridai and by the sources on the Peisistratean redaction of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in Athens, when they started to be recited at the Panathenaia festival around the mid 6th cent. BC, and on Homeric performances in Syracuse by the Homerid Kynaithos of Chios towards the end of the 6th cent. (Hippostratus, *FGrHist* 568 F 5).

¹⁴ See Pfeiffer (1968) 220.

¹⁵ See *Vita Homeri herodotea* 16 W.; Pind. fr. 265 M.; *Suda* κ 2376, s.v. Κρεώφυλος.

If East Greek guilds and Peisistratus in Athens had monopolized the Homeric texts quite early, no such thing seems to have occurred with the two main Hesiodic poems. No matter what one nowadays thinks of Hesiod, whether he was an historical person or just a poetic persona, there is no evidence of a guild of Hesiodeioi rhapsodes, nor of Peisistratus or his sons busying themselves with a redaction of the text.¹⁶ The only evidence of a Hesiodic guild might come from fr. dub. 357 (quoted above, n. 2): if it was composed by a follower of Hesiod, it could express the rivalry between Homeric and Hesiodic rhapsodes, competing on the panHellenic market. Curiously, if direct reference to the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* in early Athens is missing, thin evidence that the Peisistratids had an interest in the body of epics associated with Hesiod's name is offered by Plutarch, who also wrote a commentary on Hesiod in four books (Plut. fr. 102 S. = T 147). Plutarch relates that Peisistratus intended to promote Theseus as the main Athenian hero; in order to clean his reputation as a "favour to the Athenians," he removed from a Hesiodic poem (now generally identified as the *Aegimius*: fr. 298) a line which presented Theseus as a womanizer, falling in love for Aegle after abandoning Ariadne.¹⁷ For the same reason, Plutarch continues, Peisistratus had inserted a line in the Homeric *Odyssey* (11.631) which presented Theseus and Peirithous as sons of gods.

Early evidence of the Hesiodic corpus (6th–5th centuries BC)

Besides the line on Theseus, knowledge of Hesiod and of some poems of the corpus can be attested with fair confidence as early as the 6th cent. BC in authors of different genres: poets, philosophers, and prose writers. The circulation of another poem—the *Shield* of Heracles—in early Athens can be convincingly attested judging from the vast output of black- and early red-figure vases (around 120), mainly Attic between c. 565 and 480 BC, portraying the combat between Heracles and Cycnus.¹⁸ The part played by Athena as warrior goddess in the poem may account for its popularity

¹⁶ Albeit interesting, the hypothesis that the poet and oracle monger Onomacritus was responsible for tampering with the text of the Hesiodic poems under the Peisistratids rests on no solid ground: see, most recently, D'Agostino (2007) XXVII–XXIX.

¹⁷ Plut. *Thes.* 20.1–2, relying on Hereas of Megara (4th cent. BC, *FGrHist* 486 F 1); see West (1966) 48 n. 1.

¹⁸ See Russo (1965) 26–28, 32; Shapiro (1984); Janko (1986) 39.

in Attica. Knowledge of the *Shield* outside of Athens in the early 6th cent., in an area as distant as Sicily, is asserted in the ancient *Argument* of the poem (T 52), according to which the lyric poet Stesichorus ascribed it to Hesiod. The statement must be handled with care, since the dating of Stesichorus may antecede that of the *Shield* or be just coeval; it could originate from the fact that Stesichorus also composed a poem on the fight between Heracles and Cycnus (*Cycnus*, Stesich. fr. 207 Davies).¹⁹

Concerning the major Hesiodic poems, the authorship of a *Theogony* is an established fact towards the end of the archaic age (late 6th cent. BC), as can be deduced from the criticism aimed against Hesiod by the pre-socratic philosophers Xenophanes of Colophon and Heraclitus of Ephesus: the first blamed Hesiod and Homer in his verses for representing the gods in the most shameful way by equating their actions and blemishes to those of humans (21 B 1.19–24; 11; 14 Diels-Kranz), while Heraclitus took issue with his supposed *polymathie*, and also with the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, for the wrong distinction between day and night, and between lucky and unlucky days (22 B 40; 57; 106 Diels-Kranz).²⁰ Knowledge of Hesiod's *Theogony* in the 6th cent. can perhaps also be inferred from the prose writer Pherecydes of Syros, whose aim was to provide an alternative version to Hesiod's poem (cf. fr. 64 Schibli).

The late-archaic lyric poets also undoubtedly relied on the wealth of the Hesiodic corpus: attribution to Hesiod of the *Theogony* and also of the *Catalogue of Women* by the lyric poet Simonides (6th/5th cent. BC) can be inferred from a saying quoted in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum Graecum* (= T 16) according to which Hesiod planted the mythical stories about the gods and the heroes, τὰς περὶ θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων μυθολογίας. In the early 5th cent. BC explicit mention and quotation of Hesiod is found in Pindar, *Isthm.* 6.67, recalling *WD* 412; according to the scholia, the myth of Heracles and Telamon in the same ode (vv. 35–56) was taken from the *Great Ehoiai* (= fr. 250). Pindar may also have been familiar with the *Wedding of Ceyx* (cf. Pind. fr. 168 ab M.; Hes. fr. 265), and it has been plausibly assumed that in the third *Pythian* ode he relied on

¹⁹ See the diverging opinions of Davison (1968 [1955]) 82–83, and Janko (1986) 41–42, 49–51. The fanciful information that Hesiod was considered by some the father of Stesichorus (Aristotle, *Constitution of Orchomenus*, fr. 565 Rose = Hes. T 2; 19–20) may also have played a part in connecting the two poets.

²⁰ Note, however, that if truly referred to Hesiod by Heraclitus the word *didaskalos* in 22 B 57 may allude to the whole bulk of Hesiod's didactic poetry, including the *Works and Days*.

the *ehoie* of Cyrene in the *Catalogue of Women*.²¹ A clear reference to Hesiod also occurs in Bacchylides' *epin.* 5.191–193, which is likely to be a quotation from the *Precepts of Chiron*, the instructions imparted by the centaur Chiron upon his pupil, the young hero Achilles (= fr. dub. 344);²² a school scene with the word *Χιρώνεια* inscribed on a bookroll on a vase by Euphronios (ca. 500 BC) may also allude to the teaching of the *Precepts of Chiron* in Athens.²³

Close familiarity with the *Catalogue of Women* in particular can be detected in the mythological and genealogical lore found in the early mythographers from the late 6th cent. onwards, starting with Hecataeus of Miletus, *FGrHist* 1 F 18b; 19 (= Hes. fr. 127),²⁴ and Acusilaus of Argos, who according to Flavius Josephus very often corrected Hesiod on genealogical matters.²⁵ In the mid 5th cent., Herodotus claimed that the Greeks owed the systematization of their gods to Homer and Hesiod: they were "... the ones who established a *theogony* (θεογονίη) for the Greeks".²⁶ Herodotus was also familiar with the *Catalogue of Women*, as is demonstrated by a reference to the Hyperboreans in Hesiod which is also found in a fragment of that poem (Herodt. 4.32 ~ Hes. fr. 150.21). Knowledge of Hesiodic poetry in 5th cent. Attic comedy is attested by Aristoph. *Frogs* 1033–1034, where in a context insisting on the didactic value (cf. the verbs *deiknumi*, *didasko* at vv. 1032, 1035) of the epic poems by Orpheus, Musaeus, Hesiod and Homer, the *Works and Days* are selected; in the *Banqueters* (*Daitaleis*, 427 BC) Aristophanes made a pun of a line from the *Precepts of Chiron* (= Hes. fr. 284); he apparently

²¹ See most recently D'Alessio (2005b) 234–235, who also suggests the knowledge by Pindar of the *Great Ehoiai* and (regarding also Bacchylides) of the *Wedding of Ceyx* ([2005a] 192–195; [2005b] 263 n. 65).

²² See Maehler (2004) 128. Pindar too seems to have quoted deliberately from the *Precepts of Chiron*, according to a scholion on *Pyth.* 6.22 = Hes. fr. 283.

²³ See Schwartz (1960) 232.

²⁴ The text of the first fragment of Hecataeus may be lacunose: see Fowler *ad loc.*

²⁵ Joseph. *contra Ap.* 1.16 (= *FGrHist* 2 T 6, T 5 Fowler = Hes. T 122, cf. T 121). I am not taking into account as direct evidence for the knowledge of Hesiod in the 6th–5th. centuries identical expressions and supposed verbal allusions, nor the statements in ancient sources that in reporting a genealogy or a myth an author (e.g. Pherecydes or Acusilaus) was "following" (*akolouthein*) Hesiod. A still useful survey along these lines can be found in Buzio (1938).

²⁶ Since Herodotus (2.53.2 = Hes. T 98) refers the word '*theogony*' also to Homer, it must not be taken as a proper reference to the title of Hesiod's poem; as far as we can tell, the first to call his poem *Θεογονία* was the stoic philosopher Chrysippus (3rd cent. BCE: fr. 908 von Arnim); it was also called *θεῶν γένεσις* in antiquity (cf. *θεῶν γένος* ... *κλείουσιν*, *Th.* 44).

also drew on the aforementioned *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* in the *Peace* (1282–1283), where the boy responds (1283–1284) with a couplet adapted from one delivered by Homer in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (9 West). The canonization of Hesiod in comedy is attested already in the mid 5th cent. BC, with the *Hesiodoi* (fr. 15–24 K.–A.) composed by Telecleides.

The Hesiodic corpus in the Hellenistic and Imperial age

Once the knowledge and circulation of some Hesiodic poems in 6th and 5th cent. Greece has been widely attested, there is no need to pursue a detailed survey of the 4th cent., since the range of poems quoted by the extant sources is even smaller and no further title is mentioned. Extended knowledge mainly of the *Works and Days* and the *Theogony*, with scanty references to other poems such as the *Catalogue of Women* and the *Precepts of Chiron*, is attested in Athens among orators (Aeschines, Demosthenes) and philosophers (Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Diogenes of Sinope, Zeno of Citium).²⁷ A new and more significant aspect to surface in this period is a scholarly interest in a number of issues pertaining not only to the poems, but also to the persona of Hesiod: his biography and relation to Homer had by then become a topic to be dealt with in separate works, along with questions originating from his poems (see T 128–131). Aristotle wrote a treatise in one book called *Hesiodic Problems* (*Aporemata*) and also dealt with biographical aspects in the *Constitution of Orchomenus* (fr. 565 Rose); Heraclides Ponticus wrote a treatise in two books *On the Age of Homer and Hesiod*; Hecataeus of Abdera and Chamaeleon wrote on Homer and Hesiod, and two other Peripatetics, Megacleides and Praxiphanes, dealt with philological issues which were taken up by Alexandrian scholarship; probably at the beginning of the 3rd cent., Antidorus of Cyme also wrote a treatise on Homer and Hesiod (= T 133). From the last quarter of the 4th cent. in Athens, and throughout the Hellenistic and Imperial age at Alexandria, Pergamon and Rome, the intense activity carried out by scholars attests to the existence of the Hesiodic corpus and to the interest it raised in matters of authenticity and attribution. At Alexandria, work on Hesiod was started by the first head of the Library, Zenodotus, who produced an edition of the *Theogony*, and

²⁷ A survey of the ancient sources quoting Hesiod in the 4th cent. BC is found in Buzio (1938) 131–159; see also Montanari, this volume.

all the grammarians followed his tracks, including Apollonius of Rhodes, Aristophanes of Byzantium, who gauged the authenticity of some poems, and Aristarchus of Samothrace, who commented on the *Works and Days* and on the *Theogony*, and wrote a treatise *On the Age of Hesiod*.²⁸ The existence of specific commentaries (*hypomnemata*) on the *Catalogue of Women* can only be conjectured, since no explicit evidence remains, and no scholion on the poem has survived.²⁹ At Pergamon Crates of Mallos, Aristarchus' contemporary and rival, dealt with the *Theogony*, the *Works and Days*, the *Shield* and the *Catalogue of Women* (see fr. 78–81 Broggiato), and further work on the Hesiodic corpus there may have been carried out by Artemon and Asclepiades of Myrleia (2nd–1st cent. BC).

The scholars at Alexandria and Pergamon found themselves faced with problems of forgery, interpolation, and attribution. The awareness that poems or sections of poems were arbitrarily tagged with the name of Hesiod is expressed in the 1st cent. BC by the felicitous adjective ψευδοησιόδειον, “falsely attributed to Hesiod”, used by Cicero,³⁰ and surfaces also in other authors. In point of fact, as shown by Pausanias (9.31.4–5, quoted above) and attested by other sources in relation to individual poems, doubts about the attribution to Hesiod affected all poems except the *Works and Days* whose proem, however, was considered spurious by many scholars from different schools: in the 4th cent. BC at Athens the Peripatetic Praxiphanes, a pupil of Theophrastus, pronounced the proem spurious on the ground that he had found a copy of the poem which lacked the invocation to the Muses and started directly with v. 11 on the existence of two Strifes. Similarly in Alexandria, in the 2nd cent. BC, the grammarian Aristarchus obelized the proem, for reasons unknown (see *schol. Hes. Op. prolegom.*, 2.7–12 = T 49). At Pergamon the same opinion was shared by Crates, who took the further step of athetizing even the proem of the *Theogony*, on the ground that both proems could be put in front of any poem (fr. 78 Broggiato = T 50).

It is remarkable that a few centuries later a similar opinion was expressed to Pausanias, although with a more radical stand, by the countrymen of Hesiod who ascribed to the poet only the *Works and Days*; from this

²⁸ See Schroeder (2007) 138–141; for the study of Hesiod in the Hellenistic age see Jacoby (1930) 44–51; Schwartz (1960) 609–625; Pfeiffer (1968) *Index s.v.* ‘Hesiod’; Montanari, this volume.

²⁹ The only sign of editorial activity occurs in POxy 2075, fr. 1 and POxy 2487 fr. 1, where a few lines are obelized (= fr. 25.26–33; 129.47–50).

³⁰ Cic. *ad Attic.* 7.18.4: *ego autem etsi illud ψευδοησιόδειον—ita enim putatur—obseruo* ... “as for me, I like to follow the maxim, falsely attributed—as is thought—to Hesiod ...”.

poem they removed the proem to the Muses, saying that it begins with the lines about the Strifes (vv. 11 f.). Pausanias was also shown an old leaden tablet damaged by time with the text lacking the proem, like the one seen by Praxiphanes centuries before; it follows that the learned tradition attested by (pre-)Hellenistic scholarship converged with a local tradition preserved at a much later time in an unscholarly milieu. It is also interesting to note that the absence of the proem was not felt awkward in antiquity: the poem was considered complete by scholars and by the countrymen of Hesiod even if it started abruptly *in medias res* at v. 11 by modifying the theory of the birth of one Strife exposed in the *Theogony* (225). The reasons for athetizing the proem may have been various: on the one hand, bearing no connection with what followed, proems could be replaced or eliminated without affecting the overall structure and comprehension of an epic poem, as is shown by the three alternative proems of the *Iliad* circulating in antiquity, and by the nature and function of the *Homeric Hymns*. On the other hand, proems could also depend on the occasion of rhapsodic performances and therefore required to be free from personal and distinctive features; this fact may account for the rejection of a fixed prologue tagged on the poems, and may apply both to the short and unimpressive proem of the *Works and Days* and to the grandiose and elaborate proem of the *Theogony*, where the name of Hesiod occurs at v. 22.³¹ As already mentioned, the latter was actually rejected only by Crates for quite the opposite reason; at Alexandria its authenticity was surely guaranteed by the favour it met with the greatest of the poet scholars, Callimachus, who explicitly referred to it as an influential poetic antecedent in the prologue of the *Aetia* (fr. 2 Pf.). Although no Hellenistic scholar seems to have disputed the authenticity of the *Theogony*, in later times Pausanias repeatedly expressed his doubts about it: after ascribing the *Theogony* to Hesiod in 1.28.6, he becomes more sceptical as he proceeds in his *periegesis* (cf. 8.18.1; 9.27.2; 9.35.5).

Regarding the text of the *Works and Days*, it probably was handed down to Alexandria in a longer version, featuring a section on *Ornithomanteia* (divination from birds) which followed v. 828; a scholion on that line of the poem (T 80) relates that Apollonius of Rhodes considered it spurious. His judgement proved influential, since the *Ornithomanteia* is now lost: it was still circulating incorporated in some copies of the

³¹ For various explanations for the rejection of the proem of the *Works and Days* see West (1978) 136–137; Verdenius (1985) 13; Lamberton (1988) 44–48.

Works and Days in the 2nd cent. AD, since Pausanias (9.31.5) reports that according to some Hesiod composed “everything that follows after the *Works and Days*”.

The *Shield*. As far as we can tell, the first Hesiodic poem to raise controversy over various matters in pre-Alexandrian times was the *Shield*: after the dubious evidence of Stesichorus (see above), its authenticity was advocated by the Athenian Peripatetic Megacleides (fr. 7 Janko), who nevertheless censured Hesiod because he represented Hephaestus making weapons for an enemy (Heracles) of his mother (Hera).³² In the third book of an unspecified treatise on Hesiod, apparently responding to the challenge of other scholars, Apollonius of Rhodes reasserted a few decades later the authenticity of the *Shield*, on the ground of style and of the occurrence of Heracles and Iolaus elsewhere in the *Catalogue* (fr. 230). After Apollonius, a more cautious stand was taken by Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 406 Slater): noting that the first section of the poem (vv. 1–56) was part of the fourth book of the *Catalogue of Women*, Aristophanes suspected that the *Shield* was not by Hesiod, but by someone deliberately imitating the Homeric shield in *Iliad* 18. Similarly, in a later period a scholion on Dionysius Thrax explicitly called it a ψευδεπίγραφον, a “falsely titled book”, claiming that the poem was written by someone who used the name and title of Hesiod, thus hoping it would be judged worth reading (T 53; 55); doubts about the author had also been expressed by pseudo-Longinus (*De Sublim.* 9.5), and Pausanias significantly omits the *Shield* in the long list of Hesiodic poems he quotes (T 42, quoted above). Yet, despite the pronouncement by Aristophanes, the opposite view prevailed: the fact that in the 1st cent. AD Seleucus of Alexandria and Epaphroditus, both active in Rome, wrote a commentary on the *Shield* indicates that they took it as a genuine work by Hesiod (T 144–145); in the end, it was the only poem of the corpus to find its way in the manuscript tradition with the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.

The *Catalogue of Women*. The ancient sources often demonstrate full awareness that the authorship of most Hesiodic poems was dubious, or else that the texts may have been tampered with or interpolated in the course of time: Plutarch thought that the *Wedding of Ceyx* had been interpolated into Hesiod’s works (= T 67). Besides, interpolation for political reasons was noted not only by Plutarch in relation to the line

³² Most information on ancient controversy over the *Shield* is provided by the ancient hypothesis to the poem (*argum.* Hes. *Scut.* = T 52), where manuscript tradition read Megacles instead of Megacleides, now accepted by all the editors.

on Theseus mentioned earlier (F 298), but also by Pausanias who credits Hesiod or “one of the poets who interpolated his verses” with a version on Asclepius’ mother invented *ad hoc* in order “to ingratiate himself with the Messenians” (Paus. 2.26.7 = *Catalogue of Women*, F 50). In the 2/3rd cent. AD, in dealing with the number of Niobe’s children, after mentioning the Hesiodic version, Aelian specifies: “unless these verses are not by Hesiod, but have been passed off falsely as his, like many other passages” (*Var. Hist.* 12.36 = *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 183).

However, it must be pointed out that, as far as the *Catalogue of Women* is concerned, the suspicion of interpolation was limited to groups of verses: scholars at Alexandria and Pergamon unanimously considered it to be a genuine work of Hesiod, and it was rejected only by the Boeotians, along with all the other poems but the *Works and Days* (Paus. 9.31.4–5).³³ The authoritative status of the *Catalogue* in the Hellenistic age was undoubtedly enforced by its close association with the *Theogony*. Two lines of a new invocation to the Muses connecting the ending of the *Theogony* (1019–1020) to the *Catalogue* are attested in some manuscripts of the *Theogony* and in a papyrus dating from the 2nd cent. AD (POxy 2354) presenting the very beginning of the *Catalogue*: “And now sing of the tribe of women, sweet-voiced / Olympian Muses, daughters of aegis-holding Zeus”.³⁴ If genuine, the couplet shows that the *Catalogue of Women* was from the start conceived by Hesiod as a natural continuation of the *Theogony*; if added later, it may be the work either of a Hesiodic rhapsode or of a preAlexandrian scholar. Whoever the author, by picking up the previous invocation introducing the unions between goddesses and mortal men in the last section of the *Theogony* (965–968), the re-invocation to the Muses announcing the unions between gods and mortal women was intended to effectively weld together the two poems. The elaborate map of heroic genealogies was seen as a completion of the cosmogonic and divine genealogies, creating a narrative sequel which proceeded from Chasm to the world of the gods and terminated with the annihilation of the generation of the heroes in the war at Troy, as is specified in the fifth and last book of the *Catalogue* (fr. 204.95 ff.). A similar procedure was devised in the Hellenistic age, when the last line

³³ For the assumption that the *Catalogue of Women* is by Hesiod cf. Apollonius of Rhodes (= Hes. fr. 230), Crates (fr. 80 Broggiato), (Aristarchus) *sch.* Hom. *Il.* 23.683 b E; West (1985) 127.

³⁴ *Th.* 1021–1022 = *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 1.1–2: νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν φύλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυνέπειαι / Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

of the *Iliad* dealing with the funeral of Hector was modified in order to accomodate the mention of the Amazon Penthesileia, who was to play a key role in the following poem of the Trojan epic cycle, the *Aethiopis*:³⁵ a tighter connection was thus worked out between different poems and episodes of the war at Troy.

The implications of an expanded version of a single Hesiodic poem including the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue of Women* have been adequately considered by West.³⁶ The main issue at stake is that either Hesiod himself composed the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue* as one single poem, or (more plausibly) that “at some time between 700 and 300, then, the *Theogony* in the original form as composed by Hesiod gave place to an expanded version which formed merely the preface to the much longer *Catalogue*”.³⁷ Another, by no means marginal, issue raised by West was that the original ending of the *Theogony* should be placed at around v. 900, since the section from v. 901 to 1020 bears many more similarities with the *Catalogue* than with the rest of the poem in matters of formulaic diction and style; besides, the mythological details narrated in the ending of the poem seem to point to a later period than Hesiod’s.³⁸ Whatever one is inclined to think of the authenticity of the last section of the *Theogony*, it was in the expanded version leading into the *Catalogue* that it reached the libraries of Alexandria and Pergamon; the separation between the two poems was probably effected by an Alexandrian grammarian, marking off the ending of the *Theogony* at v. 1020, and identifying the following invocation as the beginning of the *Catalogue*; the division of the poem in five books must have occurred at the same time. As mentioned earlier, a similar intervention by Apollonius of Rhodes had separated at v. 828 the *Works and Days* from the *Ornithomanteia*, causing the loss of the latter.

It must however be clarified that the *Catalogue of Women* probably circulated in more than one version in the Hellenistic age, as well as at an earlier stage: its loose structure was likely to incorporate in the course of time genealogical accretions and expansions, along with modification of separate entries and sections. This point is demonstrated by the existence

³⁵ See *Aeth.* fr. 1 B./W. = *sch.* Hom. *Il.* 24.804 b E.; PLitLond 6, col. XXII 43.

³⁶ West (1966) 48–50, 437; (1985) 1–2, 125–128.

³⁷ West (1966) 49, who favours the second hypothesis; see also pp. 48–49; West (1985) 2–3, 125–128.

³⁸ West (1966) 49–50; 397–437; (1985) 2–3, 125–128. It should be recalled that the argument on the lateness of the linguistic and mythological elements has lost weight in the last decades: see most recently Janko (1982) 85–86, 221–223, 247 n. 37; Dräger (1997) 1–26.

of an expanded version of the *Catalogue*, the *Great Ehoiai*, and can only be enforced if, as some think, the *Great Ehoiai* was actually an independent poem from the *Ehoiai* (see below, p. 118ff.). A certain fluidity in tradition must be taken into account, all the more so if one considers the political implications of myth and of genealogical discourse in early Greece, and the way in which epic poetry could be used as powerful ammunition in all sorts of dispute: aristocratic families had an interest in legitimating their claims and influence by linking past and present, by stressing their genealogical connections to eponymous or prominent heroes.

For quite a time after the separation of the two poems the *Catalogue* was felt integral to the *Theogony*, and arranged together with it and the *Works and Days*, so as to form a prominent Hesiodic triad following a linear sequence from the cosmic level of the *Theogony* to the heroic world and ending with the description of the ordinary and problematic life for humanity in the *Works and Days*. In the 1st cent. BC, an epigram on Hesiod by Archias (or Asclepiades, *AP* 9.64 = *T* 44) mentioned the three poems placing the *Catalogue* third after *Theogony* and *Works and Days*; at a later period Pausanias (1.3.1) probably read a Hesiodic text where the *Theogony* was still followed by the *Catalogue of Women* with the *Works and Days* coming third.³⁹ The same arrangement is found in Lucian (*Hes.* 1 = *T* 45); a late poem from the 3rd/4th cent. AD preserved on papyrus still presents the sequence *Theogony-Catalogue of Women*, with an allusion to the *Works and Days* in the following lines.⁴⁰

The number of papyri recovered shows that the popularity and circulation of the *Catalogue* lasted until the 4th cent. AD; still, although it surely was one of the most widely read poems in the libraries of Graeco-Roman Egypt, it did not find its way in the medieval manuscript transmission. In the Roman period a new and more problematic selection and arrangement of the main Hesiodic poems appears, whereby the *Theogony* is followed by the *Works and Days* and by the *Shield*; two conflicting traditions are likely to have circulated for some time, and as a consequence of the final selection, the *Catalogue* did not survive antiquity. Two papyri (both codices) from the 4th cent. AD, featuring fragments (PVindob G 19815) and the titles of the 3 poems (PACHmîm 3), attest to the canonization of

³⁹ Nothing can be made out of the lacunose text of Callimachus' *Aetia*, fr. 2 Pf., in order to retrieve a third poem after *Theogony* and *Works and Days* (vv. 3, 5). On the Pausanias passage see West (1966) 426 (*contra* Wilamowitz [1928] 6).

⁴⁰ POxy 3537 recto, 3-16 = *Hes.* *T* 95.

the new Hesiodic triad. The list of Hesiod's poems in the *Suda*, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, also opens with the triad *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, *Shield*, followed by the *Catalogue*.⁴¹

As far as the evidence goes, *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, and *Shield* were the only *πραπτόμενα*, the poems edited and commented by the ancient grammarians;⁴² in the 1st cent. AD Seleucus of Alexandria wrote a commentary on all of them (fr. 27–33 Müller = T 144), and the scholia to the three poems were later preserved in the medieval manuscript tradition. The inclusion of the *Shield* in the Hesiodic triad to the detriment of the *Catalogue of Women* leaves two questions unanswered: to begin with, it is hard to explain why no evidence is available of a commentary on the latter poem, despite: a) its being unanimously accepted as authentic in the scholarly milieu of Alexandria and Pergamon, whereas Aristophanes of Byzantium judged the *Shield* spurious; b) the widespread interest it attracted, attested by innumerable quotations in the scholia to other authors. Secondly, the choice of the *Shield* is puzzling:⁴³ school use is highly unlikely to have been the reason, since no didactic purpose or *ethos* can be detected in the poem. Contrary to what happened with the *Catalogue of Women*, the *Shield* was not placed after the *Theogony*, but after the *Works and Days*;⁴⁴ indeed, the celebration of Heracles, the civilizing hero who in the *Theogony* acts as an instrument of the justice of Zeus, provided a mythological link between the two poems and was surely conclusive in the selection of the *Shield*, which survives in medieval manuscripts both in isolation and associated with the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. Along this line of interpretation, a change of taste and perspective among scholars and readers may have occurred: the genre of the *Shield* was felt more complementary to the two major Hesiodic poems, similarly to what happened with the *Margites*. No matter how remote it was from the grandeur of Homer's poems, the *Margites* was believed to be genuinely Homeric by Aristotle (*Poet.* 1448b 24), on the grounds that its iambic verses represented the archetype of a new poetic genre, half serious—half comic. On the other hand, for what regards the dropping out of the triad of the *Catalogue of Women*, an additional rea-

⁴¹ For the possibility that all four poems were included in a parchment codex of the 4th cent. AD see West (1978) 78 and n. 2.

⁴² See Wilamowitz (1928) 5; Jacoby (1930) 46–50; on the commentaries to the *Shield* see above, p. 104.

⁴³ The point is raised by Schwartz (1960) 617 f. and West (1966) 51 and n. 1.

⁴⁴ The text used by Servius may have been an exception to this: see Jacoby (1930) 50 n. 1; Schwartz (1960) 621.

son could be that its excessive length became problematic; the ‘epyllion’ size of the *Shield* was a better match for the limited length of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, likely to facilitate the arrangement of the three poems together.

The poems

The following presentation aims mainly at sketching out the context and the subject of the poems, often a desperate task because of their fragmentary state, and at pointing out the specific problems pertaining to each of them. The broad division between non didactic and didactic poems (the *Precepts of Chiron*, the *Great Works*, the *Astronomy*, the *Ornithomanteia*, although this was probably a section of the *Works and Days*) traced out by Marckscheffel ([1840] 88–89) has been maintained, and the more dubious poems (in matter of existence) have been placed at the end.

Shield

Being the only poem of the corpus to have come down in full through medieval tradition, the *Shield of Heracles* (Ἀσπίς) necessitates little comment and presentation. The poem originates from the unskillful juxtaposition of two independent sections of uneven length (1–56, 57–480), which were welded together sometime in the 6th cent. BC; it affords an interesting insight on the re-use and relocation of catalogic poetry within a larger frame of heroic epic and ecphrastic poetry. The open system on which the *Catalogue of Women* was built allowed for the insertion of an episode into a different narrative scheme, to serve as an introduction to the second and longer poem. As the very first line displaying the formula (ἢ οἷη, “or such as”) reveals, and the ancient *hypothesis* to the poem confirms, the opening 56 lines are taken from the *ehoie* of Alcmene (= fr. 195.8–64), a long narrative dealing with the mother of Heracles and her sexual encounter on the same night with Zeus and with her husband Amphytrion. Twins were subsequently born from the double union, one far superior to the other: Heracles and Iphicles. The birth of Heracles is presented here as a plan conceived by Zeus in order to father a hero who would protect both gods and men against ruin (v. 27–29), recalling the presentation of Heracles as a civilizing hero sketched in the *Theogony*. Heracles was a seminal figure also in other poems of the Hesiodic corpus,

notably in the *Great Ehoiai*, in the *Wedding of Ceyx*, and probably in the *Aegimius*. His prominent status is also highlighted in the proem of the *Catalogue*, where he is named next to the gods who mingled with mortal women (fr. 1.22).

When the *ehoie* ends mentioning the birth of Heracles and Iphicles, an abrupt and clumsy transition follows, introducing in the first line (v. 57) the theme of the poem (v. 57–480), the death of Cycnus at the hands of Heracles. As is clarified only at the very end of the poem, in what looks like an additional coda (v. 477–480), Cycnus, a son of Ares located in Thessaly, is punished for his bad habit of attacking the pilgrims on their way to Delphi, and stealing the offerings that were meant for Apollo. In the confrontation, which takes place in the precinct of the temple of Apollo at Pagasae, Heracles is aided by his nephew Iolaus, who serves as his charioteer, and benefits from the advice of Athena on how to face Ares. Cycnus is sided by Ares who, after the death of his son, fights Heracles and is eventually wounded by him (v. 426–466). Although the plot of the *Shield* rests on the fight between Heracles and Cycnus, the long scene preceding the clash is uninspired, and the fight and death of Cycnus are disposed of in a limited number of verses (370–423): the core of the poem, from which its title derives, consists in a disproportionately long and detailed description of the shield that Heracles takes with him in the fight (v. 139–321), providing a counterpoint to the famous ecphrasis of the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad* (18.478–608). The fact that the ecphrasis in the *Shield* is about 50 percent longer reveals the different style and taste of the author, and his peculiar way of interacting with the Homeric antecedent by surpassing it, exaggerating and heightening many points.⁴⁵

The junction between the two sections of the poem is not without clumsiness, as is shown by the reprise at the beginning of the narrative proper of a motif narrated in the *ehoie* of Alcmena: at vv. 78–88 Heracles in person tells Iolaus the circumstances of his own birth and that of Iphicles, thus picking up from a different perspective what had just been narrated at vv. 27–56. Despite its taste for redundancy, for gore details and for repetition, the *Shield* is an interesting poem in itself, insofar as it often displays a clever adaptation of the traditional material, developing the language of epic poetry in new aesthetic and visual directions. Being the only poem from the Hesiodic corpus that has survived in full, it affords a clear view of its structure and organization. Epic doublets

⁴⁵ The style, peculiarities and aim of the poem are fully explored by Russo (1965); Lamberton (1988) 137–144; Toohey (1988); Martin (2005).

have been incorporated into the text in a number of places (see Russo [1965] 57–59; Janko [1986] 38–40), preserving traces of early rhapsodic performances which presumably took place at Athens, where its popularity is attested in the late 6th cent. (see above, p. 98). The date, place and occasion of the original performance of the poem have been a matter of discussion in recent scholarship: political and historical references have been spotted in different parts (15–26, 84 f., 104 f., 477–480). The celebration of the triumph of Theban Heracles over the Thessalian bandit Cycnus, who endangered the pilgrims' way to the temple of Apollo at Delphi, points to a pro-Theban bias on the part of the poet, and the coda of the poem must be related to the first Sacred War and its consequences, thus placing the composition of the *Shield* between the first and the second quarter of the 6th cent. BC. Although conclusive evidence is missing, Janko (1986) 42–48 has convincingly suggested that the occasion for the original performance of the poem may have been the athletic event of the Heracleia/Iolaea games at Thebes.

Catalogue of Women

Within the range of the Hesiodic corpus, beside the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* a true panHellenic status was achieved by the *Catalogue of Women* (Γυναικῶν [ἡρώων] Κατάλογος). Divided in five books, the poem was also known in antiquity with the alternative title *Ehoiai* (Ἠοῖαι) derived from the formula *ehoie* (ἢ οἷη, “or such as”, “or like her”), a device used to introduce some of the entries, from which the title of another Hesiodic poem, the *Great Ehoiai*, is also derived. The recurrent *ehoie* formula could serve as a flexible and effective tool, allowing the poet to connect unrelated entries by simple juxtaposition, or else to leap back from one branch of a genealogy to the main tree in the case of elaborate family trees, and also to insert expansions and accretions in order to accommodate a new genealogy.⁴⁶

The recitation of mythical genealogies and of catalogic poetry has always been popular and important among the Greeks, starting with the *Catalogue of Ships* in the *Iliad*. The early genealogical poems of Asius

⁴⁶ Leo (1894) must be credited for identifying the *Catalogue of Women* with the *Ehoiai*. On the meaning and function of the formula ἢ οἷη see West (1985) 1, 56, 121–122; Rutherford (2000); Hirschberger (2004) 30–31. West (1985) is the most useful and comprehensive study on all the aspects of the *Catalogue*, including a survey of genealogical poetry of other cultures; see also Schwartz (1960) and Hirschberger (2004) 21–81 on general issues, followed by a thorough commentary on the fragments.

of Samos and Cinaethon of Sparta, and to a lesser extent of Hegesinos and of Chersias of Orchomenus, were still available at the time of Pausanias (see 4.2.1; 9.29.1; 9.38.9). Genealogical matters were also dealt with in anonymous epic poems, like the *Phoronis*, most of them with a local flavour; interestingly, Pausanias quotes from another archaic epic, the *Naupactia*, adding that it was “intended for women” (10.38.11: ἔπεσιν ... πεποιημένοις ἐς γυναῖκας), and the few extant fragments show similarities with the *Catalogue of Women* in subject matter, suggesting that there too genealogies were developed from various heroines. A closer kinship can be detected with the catalogue of heroines in book 11 of the Homeric *Odyssey*, set in the underworld: having met the ghosts of the ladies from the past, Odysseus relates their pedigrees and the events which led to their death. Several of these heroines were also included in the *Catalogue of Women* (Tyro, Chloris, Iphimedeia, Leda, Antiope, Alcmene), and in some cases the Hesiodic text reveals close convergence with Homer, the clearest overlap between the *Odyssey* and the *Catalogue* being the account of Tyro and Poseidon.⁴⁷

Until the middle of the past century, the poem was known mainly through citations and testimonies from a variety of sources, but the situation has undergone a radical change with the steady publication of a substantial number of papyri: around 50 different manuscripts of the poem are now listed, showing that in imperial Egypt the antiquarian and genealogical lore conveyed by the *Catalogue* had not been entirely replaced by mythological compendia and prose treatises. Despite the lacunosity of most papyrus fragments, we are offered a much clearer view of its general structure, in particular of the first book which seems to have been copied more frequently than the rest.⁴⁸

Taking into account all the papyri published at the time, the thorough edition by Merkelbach and West (1967, *editio maior*) has assembled 245 fragments and brought about a radical change in respect to all previous editions. Following the same order as in the *Library* of Apollodorus, a mythological handbook dating from the 1st/2nd cent. AD, the fragments have been assembled within the framework of the offspring of the four primary ancestors (Aeolos, Inachos, Pelasgos, and Atlas), expanding over

⁴⁷ Cf. *Od.* 11.249–250 with Hes. fr. 31.2–3, and v. 251 with fr. 31.7: even the context (Poseidon’s address to Tyro) is identical. On differences and similarities between the two catalogues see Page (1955) 35–38; Schwartz (1960) 529–548; Rutherford (2000) 93–96, interpreting the *Odyssey* catalogue as an early form of *ehoie*-poetry.

⁴⁸ On the papyri of the *Catalogue* see most recently Marcotte and Mertens (1994); Casanova (2008).

the book division. The family of Deukalion, the son of Prometheus, from Northern Greece, was accommodated in book 1 and part of book 2 (= fr. 2–121): it included the families of Hellen and Aeolos, the latter beginning with Atalante. The family of Inachos (Argives) occupied the rest of book 2 and part of book 3, including the descendants of Belus and Agenor (= fr. 122–159); the family of Pelasgos and Arkas (Arcadians) (= fr. 160–167) and the family of Atlas were dealt with in book 3 and perhaps in book 4, being followed there by other groups such as the daughters of Asopus, the autochthonous Attic heroes and the descendants of Pelops, including Alcmene and the birth of Heracles (= fr. 168–195). In the reconstruction put forward by Merkelbach and West, book 5 shows quite a different layout: it consists of a separate section focusing on the antecedents of the Trojan war and effecting a transition from genealogical to catalogic poetry (fr. 196–204). A substantial part was occupied by the catalogue of Helen's suitors and related events, such as the oath imposed upon them by Tyndareus and Helen's marriage to Menelaus; an abrupt switch in the text unfolds Zeus' intention to trigger the war, with the aim of destroying the generation of the demigods (fr. 204.95–123), followed by an obscure passage about a radical change in the conditions of human life, and by a digression about the life cycle of snakes (fr. 204.124 to the end). The section on Helen's suitors and on the snake ended at about line 300 of the fifth book, leaving space for a further narrative episode on the content of which it is impossible to speculate.⁴⁹ The catalogue of suitors shares many features with the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, whereas the theme of the destruction of mankind has well-known parallels in Greek myth, as well as analogies with myths from the Near East. Zeus' plan and the motif of human over-population are given proper emphasis in the beginning of the *Cypria*,⁵⁰ and the annihilation of the demigods through the war at Troy calls to mind the myth of the heroic age in the *Works and Days* (156–173), although there the war at Thebes is also mentioned as contributing to the destruction of the heroes.

The solemn announcement in the proem (fr. 1) to narrate the mortal women who lay with gods and gave birth to the race of heroes displays an ambitious goal: the *Catalogue of Women* originates from the need to create a broad, systematic and panHellenic arrangement by families which might accommodate the main genealogies of the entire Greek world,

⁴⁹ See West (1985) 43, 50, 121.

⁵⁰ Compare Hes. fr. 204.96–100 with *Cypria*, fr. 1 B./W.

and complement the cosmogonic plan of the *Theogony*. The poet who set off to compose the *Catalogue* was faced with the immense task of collecting, connecting, and reconciling the vast number of independent or autochthonous traditions circulating in Greece, which related the main genealogies of the primary ancestors and their descendants, as well as the local genealogies connected to specific places. The political and historical implications of genealogical discourse in archaic Greece can be exemplified by the genealogy of Hellen in Hesiod: "The function of the Hellenic genealogy is to establish the degree of relatedness between the various Greek ethnic groups which are represented by their eponymous ancestors ... The Hellenic genealogy employs the metaphor of kinship to construct a system of *ranked* relationships between the groups that are represented by their eponyms".⁵¹ Similarly to what happened with some entries in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, but displaying a more sophisticated and interrelated concept, the panHellenic survey of the *Catalogue* must have reshaped and established genealogies, alliances and claims to the territory that in many occasions were different from the local traditions rooted in each region and city-state in archaic Greece.

Love, courting, weddings, deaths, apotheoses and metamorphoses, divine punishment and concise allusions to the deeds of heroes are among the most popular topics in the poem; the suitors' contest was an important theme, dealing with marriages and multiplying heroic genealogies. The *Catalogue* shows a tendency towards expanding narrative into substantial digressions in each book: besides the longest narrative on the prelude to the Trojan war at the beginning of book 5, which capped all the wedding contests previously narrated, other lengthy accounts include the story of Mestra and her failed marriage and the story of Tyro in book 1, the story of Atalante in book 2, the episode of the sons of Boreas and the Harpies in book 3, the story on Alcmene and the birth of Heracles in book 4. The context of performance of the *Catalogue* remains unclear: the flexibility of the *ehoie* formula and the magnitude of structure suggest the possibility that some parts (be it genealogical entries or mythological narrative) were performed independently, or used as introductions to longer poems, as exemplified by the *Ehoie* of Alcmene (fr. 195), which served as a prelude to the *Shield*. The same applies to the catalogue of Helen's suitors, a separate section of the *Catalogue*:

⁵¹ Hall (1997) 43; see in general pp. 34–107; Merkelbach (1968); West (1985) 8–11; Jacob (1994) 176; Fowler (1998).

it may have circulated as a self-contained poem telling the heroes who went to Troy, serving as a preliminary to the *Cypria* and an alternative to the Homeric Catalogue of Ships.

The use of the *Library* of Apollodorus in reconstructing the structure of the *Catalogue* has proved of fundamental importance: it has neither been convincingly taken to task by scholars, nor been invalidated by recent papyrus findings. The different numbering of the fragments adopted in the recent editions of the *Catalogue of Women* by Hirschberger (2004) and Most (2007) is not meant to disprove the overall layout of Merkelbach-West, but rather originates from the need to take into account the publication of other papyri and recent work on the poem.⁵² Still, a few examples can be selected which remind of the danger of too closely equating the two texts.⁵³ Apart from slight differences of detail in connecting two or more figures (e.g. Magnes and Aeolos), some characters found in the *Catalogue* such as Mestra, the descendants of Melampous, are missing in Apollodorus. The placing of Atalante in book 2 is now questioned by an ambiguous papyrus fragment, claiming her story occurred in book 3 (see Meliadò [2003]). The placing of some genealogies (e.g. the descendants of Perieres) is sometimes different, and the order of Heracles' adventures in the *Catalogue* is the reverse of that in Apollodorus, since it proceeds backwards from his death to his youth. Finally, the placing of Helen in the arrangement of Merkelbach and West is not without problems: her sisters and brothers belong in the genealogical tree of the Aiolidai in the first book (fr. 23a) where no space is left for the extended wooing of Helen, which has consequently been located in the fifth book. On the other hand, the genealogical tree of her putative father Tyndareus has been located in the third and fourth books; one more fragment associating Helen with her two sisters Timandre and Clytemnestra has been placed in the context of Tyndareus' genealogy (fr. 176), because it would be hard to reconcile with the sequence in the first book.

A more serious problem, which might invalidate not only the arrangement of the standard edition by Merkelbach and West, but also many

⁵² For example, Hirschberger and Most include two fragments about Actaeon (= fr. 103/162, *39/305), following the arguments by Casanova (1969) and Janko (1984). Hesiodic fragments published after the *editio maior* (in particular F 10(a)) have subsequently been incorporated by Merkelbach and West in a handy *editio minor* (1990: 3rd edition).

⁵³ On the limits of pressing comparison with Apollodorus too far see Heilinger (1983) 26–34; Casanova (1973) 22–27.

reconstructions of the poem put forward by scholars, has surfaced in recent studies on the interrelationship of the *Ehoiai* and the *Great Ehoiai*: it will be clarified in dealing with this other poem (see below, p. 119).

The author and date of the *Catalogue of Women* are controversial. Two main trends of interpretation may be recalled here, the easier to summarise being the one which assigns the poem to Hesiod, either on unitarian grounds often amounting to subjective statements or, more convincingly, on linguistic grounds. The latter possibility has been vigorously advocated by Janko, who in a thorough study has maintained that the language of the *Catalogue* is more or less contemporary with that of the *Theogony*: "... the consistency of the diction, the absence of widespread false archaism, and the presence of Ζηνός, are strong arguments against dating this poem much, if at all, after Hesiod".⁵⁴ Yet, the statistical method used by Janko is open to the objection that the comparison is made between texts of a very uneven kind, the full texts of *Theogony* and *Works and Days* on one side, and on the other the lacunose and fragmentary text of the *Catalogue*: the possibility remains that the many missing parts presented linguistic features disproving the seemingly homogeneous archaicity of language. Moreover, a closer look at a section of the poem which is well preserved and presents an extended non-genealogical narrative, the catalogue of Helen's suitors, undeniably reveals a number of details which are not compatible with early epic diction. Various inconcinnities and peculiarities surface in fr. 197–204 regarding language, syntax, metre, awkwardness in phrasing, misinterpretation and disruption of Homeric formulas, and clumsy readaptation of a mythical tradition.⁵⁵ Unless one thinks that the section on Helen's suitors is interpolated, or the work of a later rhapsode, such features reflect a stage of formulaic diction hard to reconcile with the 'genuine' Hesiod.

Despite ancient agreement on its authenticity, the trend of interpretation which considers the *Catalogue* not by Hesiod and posits a later date for its composition sounds far more plausible and convincing. Yet, the different views on the time and place of composition advocated by various scholars complicate the picture, insofar as no theory rests on ground solid enough to win general consensus. Whereas no alternative name can be suggested for the author, the dating of the poem is placed between the

⁵⁴ Janko (1982) 87; see pp. 85–87, 198, 221–225.

⁵⁵ See Rzach (1912) 1211–1212; Cingano (2005) 135–152, esp. 143–152; Cingano (2007) 21–22; West (2008) 34.

second half of the 7th and the last third of the 6th cent. The arguments expressed in favour of each thesis are too articulate and sometimes speculative to be adequately represented here, and it will suffice to mention the more recent and sensible ones.⁵⁶ A late (540–520 BC) composition of the poem at Athens has been claimed by West (1985) 164–171, on the grounds of linguistic, mythological and cultic details. A different area, in the region of the Delphic Amphictyony, is plausibly suggested by Fowler (1998), according to whom the poem reflects the political situation at the time of the First Sacred War in the early 6th century; finally, an origin of the poem in Eastern Aeolis towards the end of the 7th cent. has recently been argued by Hirschberger (2004) on mythological and linguistic grounds.

If no fullfledged name or decisive proof can be brought as an alternative to Hesiodic authorship, further considerations of a different kind can be recalled (and have been alluded to earlier on) to advocate a later date and composition by an unidentifiable rhapsode, no differently from what is now assumed to have happened with the two Homeric poems. It has rightly been noted that “we may fairly apply to it [the *Catalogue*] that adjective which has been often used of them: ‘monumental’”.⁵⁷ considering the nature and function of catalogic poetry, and the political and historical implications underlying various genealogical links, it seems more fruitful to surmise a long and open gestation for the composition of the *Catalogue*, starting perhaps (but not necessarily) from a Hesiodic original. A stage of oral circulation of the poem must be assumed, during which rhapsodes accommodated variations and new entries, filling up gaps and inserting local details so as to meet the expectations of the audience in the main places and areas where the poem was performed (e.g. the region of the Delphic Amphictyony, Athens). Finally, at some point in the 6th cent. a skilled rhapsode, or a Hesiodic school of rhapsodes whose existence it is impossible to substantiate but plausible to imagine, masterminded the final form of the poem, in order to encompass and harmonize all the genealogical lore conveyed in the course of time in a more haphazard arrangement. The reshuffle and the more accurate linkage between the different sections (operated also through the

⁵⁶ For a detailed account of different views on the date and authorship of the poem see most recently Hirschberger (2004) 42–51; Rutherford (2005) 114–117. On the ambiguous evidence of the *ehoie* of Cyrene (fr. 215–217) for dating the *Catalogue* some time after the founding of the city (631 BC) see the opposite views of West (1985) 85–88, 132, and Janko (1982) 86, 248 n. 38; Dräger (1993) 221–228.

⁵⁷ West (1985) 125 who, however, heads for a different conclusion.

procedure of the *ehoie* device) was an essential undertaking for the *Catalogue* to reach its written, canonical form. It must be added that the existence of a poem called *Great Ehoiai*, assigned by some sources to Hesiod and thought to be either an enlarged version of the *Ehoiai*, or a longer, independent poem, points to the circulation in early Greece of more than one genealogical poem with a similar layout and purpose (see above, p. 107).

In other words, the suggestion put forward more than a century ago by Wilamowitz of an original stock out of which the Hesiodic corpus grew like a snowball (*schneeballartig*), still seems the more apt to interpret the *Catalogue of Women*.⁵⁸ It can account for most of the unsolved questions, since no conclusive evidence is available of the pervasive influence of a specific place or cultural/political context on the whole poem; it can also explain inconsistencies between different fragments (see Marcotte [1988]). This of course is not meant to deny that many linguistic elements are compatible with the early epic tradition, or that a few mythological elements are as old as Hesiod; arguably, a few of them are *only* found in the *Catalogue* and in Homer (cf. e.g. fr. 192–193 on the death of Oedipus with Hom. *Il.* 23.677–680). Hesiod himself may initially have composed a version of the *Catalogue* of a more limited scope and length (if one only thinks of the length of the *Theogony*), with a view to sketch out the main genealogies of Greece. But the scale of the enterprise and the overall concept of the *Catalogue* seem to require a later age than Hesiod's, and the work and performances of rhapsodes through a considerable period of time, rather than reflect from the start the grandiose plan of a single poet.

Great Ehoiai

A further poem with the title centered on the formula ἡ οἴη, the *Great Ehoiai* (Μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι), is assigned to Hesiod by some ancient sources, stirring disagreement among scholars as to its nature, existence, and authenticity. The main issue is whether the title refers to an independent poem, or else to an expanded version of the *Ehoiai* featuring parts that for different reasons were not included in that poem, or whether it should simply be intended as a different way to indicate the same poem. The adjective 'Great' suggests that the poem was longer than the *Catalogue of*

⁵⁸ See Wilamowitz (1905) 123–124; Solmsen (1982) 24–26; Fowler (1998) 1; Ercolani (2001) 196–212.

Women (Ehoiai), but no source quotes from it specifying the number of a book, and evidence is also missing as to its structuring principle. If, as has been suggested (D'Alessio [2005a] 205), no standard book division imposed itself, the structure may have been looser than in the *Ehoiai* because of the need to incorporate additional entries and sections, and create broader genealogical trees. If this is the case, we may assume an extended use of the formula *ehoie* as the most appropriate device to effectively connect passages and blocks which were harder to integrate in the overall layout.

It is a given fact that the *Great Ehoiai* were surely less popular than the *Catalogue*, and seem to have circulated mainly in scholarly milieus: few sources quote the poem, and explicit attribution to Hesiod is only stated by the scholia to Apollonius Rhodius and Antoninus Liberalis, by Pausanias, Athenaeus of Naucratis (T 42, 66) and by a late commentary on Aristotle. The fragments identified as belonging to the poem (fr. 246–262) deal with characters and stories that in most cases were also narrated in the *Catalogue*, occasionally with a different stress or with additional details: among them Heracles and his descendants, the Argonautic saga, Boeotian and Argive mythology. In order to maintain that the *Ehoiai* and the *Great Ehoiai* refer essentially to one and the same poem, an ingenious explanation had been tempted by Schwartz, according to which the copy preserved in the library of Pergamon went under a different title from the one at Alexandria, which preserved the canonical title *Ehoiai*; the Pergamene copy had no book division, and was more expanded and looser than the one edited at Alexandria, where a stricter scholarly tradition would favour a thinner text, emended of what was felt to be interpolated. Misled by the different title, later sources did not recognize the identity of subject matter, and a tradition developed of two different poems.⁵⁹

This interpretation, however, is ungrounded: in point of fact, as was noted long ago by Marckscheffel and by Leo, there is no reason to consider the *Great Ehoiai* and the *Catalogue* as the same poem.⁶⁰ A clear statement in Pausanias (4.2.1; see also 9.31.4–5), and two more in the scholia to Apollonius Rhodius, mention first Hesiod (that is, the

⁵⁹ See Schwartz (1960) 17–23; Casanova (1979) 236–238; Cohen (1986).

⁶⁰ Marckscheffel ([1840] 102–112); Leo (1894) 348–352; to be precise, Marckscheffel identified the *Ehoiai* with the *Great Ehoiai*, and distinguished it from the *Catalogue of Women*. For a more recent discussion see Hirschberger (2004) 27–29; D'Alessio (2005a) 177–188.

Catalogue), then the *Great Ehoiai*, showing that the two works were clearly distinguished in antiquity, and that only the authorship of the *Great Ehoiai* was dubious; conversely, no evidence is available suggesting that the two titles referred to one poem. Besides, three more sources which quote both the *Ehoiai* and the *Great Ehoiai* (the scholia to Pindar, Athenaeus, and most of all the earlier and learned Philodemus, drawing from Apollodorus of Athens, 2nd cent. BC) are careful in distinguishing between two poems or authors.

A more controversial issue is to try to assess if the *Great Ehoiai* was actually an independent poem, or an enlarged version of the *Ehoiai*, perhaps edited by the Alexandrian grammars with the learned purpose to insert in the last section additions and alternative versions whose authorship was dubious. Pausanias refers that the *Great Ehoiai* conveyed information which was missing in the *Catalogue*, whereas the scholia to Apollonius contrast two versions of the same episodes (the blinding of Phineus, Endymion) found in the *Catalogue* and in the *Great Ehoiai*; moreover, the first scholion attributes both poems to Hesiod. Other fragments relate different versions, and although the presence of contradictory versions within the same poem for the sake of a complete information cannot be ruled out, it is more plausible to think they occurred in two different poems (none of them, it should be added, by the 'genuine' Hesiod); this may well be the case with the two versions of the birth of Asclepius attested in 'Hesiod', both of them known also to the Pergamene scholars.⁶¹

No matter what option is preferred, a crucial problem has been brought to light in recent years which could have far-reaching consequences for the arrangement of the fragments of the *Catalogue* and the *Great Ehoiai*. Once the existence of the *Great Ehoiai* is accepted, and it is recognised that some papyrus fragments from Oxyrhynchus are to be assigned to this poem (fr. 251a, 259b), it follows that several episodes generally assigned to the *Catalogue* might in fact belong to the *Great Ehoiai*.⁶² The question then arises how to safely assign unattributed fragments (preserved on papyrus or quoted by other sources) to the *Catalogue* rather than to the *Great Ehoiai*; a good case in point is offered by the

⁶¹ See Casanova (1979) 239–240, opting for one poem relating the two versions; Hirschberger (2004) 84; D'Alessio (2005a) 186–188, 208–210, favouring the existence of two separate poems.

⁶² The problem has been raised by Casanova (1979) 239, and picked up by Cohen (1986) 133 n. 17, 135, 138, and D'Alessio (2005a) 206.

Cyrene-*ehoie* (fr. 215–217), but more fragments are at stake given that, as noted by D'Alessio, Merkelbach and West have assigned to the *Catalogue* most of the unattributed Hesiodic fragments “even when they come from sources which quote more often, if not solely”, the *Great Ehoiai*.⁶³ Many fragments which only bear the name of Hesiod without specifying the poem face the possibility of being misplaced, as is proved by the case of fr. 259: it can safely be assigned to the *Great Ehoiai* only because the generic attribution to Hesiod by a Pindaric scholion is integrated by Pausanias’ precision that the episode of the suitors of Hippodameia came from that very poem. When any other clue allowing to place the fragments is missing, assignment to the *Catalogue* is in many cases justified only by the tacit assumption that the poem had a far larger circulation in antiquity.

Melampodia

The Μελαμποδία was a mantic poem titled after the seer Melampous, the mythical ancestor of the Melampodids, a powerful family of seers in historical Greece with a likely interest in promoting the fame and deeds of their founder. Originally from Pylos, Melampous was a prominent figure in Greek archaic mythology and epic poetry: his story was narrated by Hesiod in two more poems, the *Catalogue* and the *Great Ehoiai* (fr. 37, 131–136, 261), and is well known to the *Odyssey* (11.281–297; 15.225–256). Another epic poem, the *Alcmaeonis*, bore the name of the hero Alcmaeon, a descendent of Melampous who travelled to Acarnania, a region with a long tradition of prophecy.

The poem was divided into at least 3 books, according to Athenaeus (fr. 277, cf. fr. 271), and was assigned either to Hesiod or to an anonymous poet. The number of books and variety of the fragments (fr. 270–279) imply that it was diffuse in content and spanned over various places and periods of time. Melampous’ mantic skill and capacity as a healer are attested in two episodes antedating the wars at Thebes and Troy, connected to Argive, Pylia, and Thessalian territory. In his first deed he wooed the daughter of Neleus on behalf of his brother Bias, tried to steal the cattle of Iphiclus and spent a year in captivity (cf. fr. 272);

⁶³ D'Alessio (2005a) 206. The rearrangement of fragments previously assigned to the *Catalogue* by Merkelbach and West among the unplaced fragments attests to the awareness of the problem in the recent edition by Most (2007) (see fr. 239–248 Most, with notes).

he was released thanks to his skills and won the hand of Pero. In the second episode (unattested in the poem, but cf. fr. 37.10–15; 131–133), Melampous delivered from madness the daughters of Proetus, king of Argos, inherited two shares of the kingdom for his brother and himself, and settled at Argos to give birth to the *genos* of the Melampodids.

Considering that, like other mythic *manteis*, Melampous was credited with quite a developed genealogy, the poem may have been either genealogical in its structure, or catalogic, since in a following sequence of events—as a few fragments testify—a string of other *manteis* was brought in the picture. A major aim of the poem must have been to bring together the main characters performing mantic roles, each of them coming from a different area and being rooted in a different epic tradition. A certain chronological flexibility is implied, since some of the seers were from a different generation, thus allowing room for extended genealogical connections. Melampous, the legendary Teiresias from Thebes and Calchas from Aulis and Troy, are associated with Mopsus, the son of Teiresias' daughter Manto who founded with her the ancient oracle of Claros (*Epigoni*, fr. 3 B./4 W.), connected to the city of Colophon on the coast of Asia Minor. It is then likely that foundation myths were also part of the narrative.

The wandering and misadventures of Teiresias also had a role in the poem: the Theban *mantis* related his peculiar experience of changing sex twice (fr. 275–276). It appears that in the *Melampodia* the Theban epics, which told the flight of Teiresias from Thebes when it was conquered by the *Epigoni*, were connected to the aftermath of the war at Troy (and to the Trojan epics), since the contest between Calchas and Mopsus took place on the way back from Troy. At some point in the sequence of events, the setting of the poem was placed at a much later time, after the end of the Trojan war, and located in Asia Minor. One of the key episodes was the divinatory contest that took place at Claros: on his way home from the war Calchas, the prophet of the Greek army at Troy, passed through Claros and challenged Mopsus to a divining contest; Calchas lost and died. Another figure with oracular powers and a descendant of the illustrious family of Melampous, Amphilochus (the brother of Alcmaeon), was also featured in the poem: he was associated to Calchas, with whom he travelled from Troy, and started a new rivalry with Mopsus. Together, they established a second oracle in the Cilician city of Mallos and eventually quarreled: Amphilochus ended up killed by Apollo in Cilicia, after causing the death of Mopsus (fr. 278–279). The story of Calchas and Mopsus was also dealt with in the epic *Nostoi*

(cf. *argum.* 2 W.), attesting to the popularity of the genre of mantic and riddle poetry. To judge from the few extant lines (fr. 278) and from the exhaustive narrative in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, which was undoubtedly modeled on this or similar archaic divinatory contests, the challenge consisted in competitive verse sequences made of ‘impossible’ questions, riddles, ambivalent propositions, and punning (see *Certamen*, 8–11 West).

Aegimius

Despite the conspicuous number of poems assigned to Hesiod in antiquity, only one name surfaces as a competitor: Cercops of Miletus, quoted by Athenaeus with Hesiod as the alternative author of the Αἰγίμιος (fr. 301). The Hesiodic authorship of the poem (fr. 294–301) is maintained only by Stephanus of Byzantium, who quotes from the second book of the poem (= fr. 296); the other sources waver between Cercops and anonymity, and the well documented Philodemus places the poet of the *Aegimius* next to Hesiod, in a context related to the daughters of Phorcys (fr. 295; *Th.* 271–283). The widely held assumption among scholars that Cercops and Hesiod competed in rhapsodic contests rests on the misinterpretation of the verb *philoneikein* in Diogenes Laertius, who quotes Aristotle (fr. 75 Rose). Indeed, in the preceding sentence the reference to Xenophanes, who also *ephiloneikei* with Hesiod when the first was already dead, clearly shows that the meaning of the verb in this context is not “to compete”, but “to take issue, to argue with, criticize”, which is just what Xenophanes did when he blamed Hesiod for misrepresenting the gods’ behaviour (see above, p. 99). Interestingly, it can now be assumed from a passage of Tzetzes’ commentary on the *Iliad* that ancient controversy over the authorship of the poem was even more confused. Tzetzes assigns the poem to an otherwise unknown Cleinias Carystios, and proceeds to quote 4 lines also found in a Euripidean scholion, who assigns it to “the poet of the *Aegimius*”.⁶⁴ A Pythagorean Cercops, author of a *katabasis* and a *hieros logos*, was also known in antiquity (Cic. *de nat.*

⁶⁴ Tzetz. *Exeg. Iliad.* 1.109, p. 200 Papathomopoulos = Hes. fr. 294; see also Papathomopoulos [1980] 27–28. In Tzetzes too the mention of Cleinias is followed by the canonical periphrasis ὁ τὸν Αἰγίμιον ποιήσας, which introduces most fragments of the poem (as well as of other poems of the Hesiodic corpus); the name of Cleinias is dropped in a scholion by Tzetzes to his own commentary, where the same fragment is quoted again (p. 457 P.).

deor. 1.107; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.131), and has often been identified with the poet of the *Aegimius*, though there is no solid evidence for this.

Coming back to Cercops, the rotation between Hesiod and him in the ancient testimonies may not necessarily imply that only one poem named *Aegimius* was composed in early Greece, or else that he should only be credited with that poem.⁶⁵ In one occasion Athenaeus (11.557A = fr. 298), far from contrasting the two poets on the authorship of the *Aegimius* (as in fr. 301), mentions Cercops and Hesiod alongside regarding the women loved by Theseus: Athenaeus brings Cercops into the context in order to add a detail on the story of Theseus and Aegle (the breaking of Theseus' oath to Ariadne), implying that such detail was missing in the Hesiodic poem. It thus follows that two independent poems were circulating, relating Theseus' love for Aegle and the sorrow of Ariadne. Further evidence that Hesiod too dealt with the story is found in Plutarch, who assigns to him a line on Theseus and Aegle (Plut. *Thes.* 20 = fr. 147 = fr. 298). Conversely, the Aristotle fragment quoted above (fr. 75 Rose), stating that Cercops criticized Hesiod, can also be taken to allude to the existence of two poems, meaning that Cercops diverged from Hesiod in narrating a myth in one of his poems.

The title of the poem is taken from the son of the eponymous hero Doros, the mythical ancestor and king of the Dorians, father of the eponymous heroes Hyllus, Dymas and Pamphilos (cf. *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 10 (a) 6–7). Aegimius was grafted as a pivotal figure to the core of traditions relating to the Dorians and the Heracleidae: his kingdom was located in the area of the Doris near mount Parnassos. Since Heracles was a prominent character in other Hesiodic poems (the *Shield*, the *Great Ehoiai*, the *Wedding of Ceyx*), the attribution of the *Aegimius* to Hesiod may have been facilitated by his main role as an ally of Aegimius in the war against the Lapiths, who had usurped the latter's kingdom (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.7.7). After the death of Heracles, Aegimius raised his son Hyllus and gave him one share of the kingdom: the three Dorian tribes originated from his association with Dymas and Pamphilos. As is the case with other Hesiodic poems centered on one name or one subject matter (*Melampodia*, *Wedding of Ceyx*), it cannot be inferred from the title, any more than from the scanty remains, that the poem was mainly concerned with the character of Aegimius. Most fragments are unrelated to the setting of the war with the Lapiths, and deal with other myths and

⁶⁵ See Wilamowitz (1916) 412, followed by Rzach (1924) 901, with further considerations.

heroes: Argo panoptes, Nauplius, Phrixos and Aietes, Theseus, Achilles (fr. 295, 297–300). The first two characters also occurred in the epic poem *Nostoi*, by Agias of Troezen. Evidence is lacking in support of an elaborate reconstruction of the poem put forward by Robertson, according to which it was the work of the orphic poet Cercops and narrated a *katabasis* of Heracles connecting various episodes of the poem.⁶⁶

Wedding of Ceyx

Doubts on the authenticity of the poem (fr. 263–269) are expressed by Plutarch and Athenaeus, who nevertheless noted its ancient flavour (= T 67–68: see above, p. 104); although some learned sources assign it to Hesiod, the fact that a commentator on Homer refers to the poem without mentioning the author (fr. 268) may reflect the doubts of Alexandrian scholarship. The Κήρυκος Γάμος was still copied in the 2nd. cent. AD, as testified by POxy 2495 (= fr. 37–38); the scanty evidence available does not support the view that it was originally an episode of the *Catalogue of Women* which was expanded into a separate section, as is the case with the *Shield*. Probably a distinct poem of unspecified length, it was passed under the name of Hesiod because of the major role played by Heracles, as happened with the *Shield* and perhaps with the *Aegimius*. One of the main subjects of the poem, if not the central one, was the wedding-feast of Ceyx, an episode preceding the fight of Heracles and Aegimius against the Lapyths in the sequence narrated by Apollodorus' *Library* (2.7.7).⁶⁷ Ceyx also occurs in the *Shield*, in the *Catalogue of Women*, with his wife Alcyone, a daughter of Aeolus (fr. 10(a)93–99), and in the *Great Ehoiai*, fr. 251(a)3. The poem may have started with Heracles leaving the ship Argo and the expedition of the Argonauts (fr. 263), and arriving unexpected and uninvited at Trachis, where Ceyx was celebrating his wedding; a similar scene, with Heracles attending the wedding banquet of Telamon, was narrated in the *Great Ehoiai* (fr. 250). Comparison with other sources, including a paean by Bacchylides (fr. 4 M.), suggests that a few episodes like the encounter of Heracles with Theiodamas, the war with the Dryopes, and an eating contest between Heracles and Lepreus, may have been dealt with before his arrival at Trachis. As is shown by its

⁶⁶ See Robertson (1980). For other suggestions on the plot of the *Aegimius* see Hall (1997) 63; Debiasi (2004) 235–237.

⁶⁷ For a detailed attempt to sketch out the plot of the poem see Merkelbach and West (1965); see also Schwartz (1960) 200–210.

popularity among the few sources quoting the poem, a key point in the context of the banquet must have been a series of riddles posed by Heracles (fr. 266a–c) after relating some of his exploits: a similar interest in enigmas and questions was expressed in the *Melampodia*.

Katabasis of Theseus and Peirithous

The problems of authorship presented by this poem are of a different kind from the rest of the corpus: Pausanias (9.31.5) is the only source to credit Hesiod with a poem on Theseus' descent to Hades together with Peirithous (ὥς Θησεὺς ἐς τὸν Ἅδην ὁμοῦ Πειρίθῳ καταβαίη), and no other testimony has survived providing the title or further information on the subject. The myth related the ill-fated descent of Peirithous into Hades, escorted by Theseus, with the aim of abducting Persephone and marrying her: the two heroes were tricked by Hades into the chairs of forgetfulness, and only Theseus was eventually rescued from the underworld by Heracles. In another passage (10.28.2), Pausanias relates that a *katabasis* of Theseus and Peirithous was narrated in the *Minyas* (*Min.* fr. 1 B./W.), an epic poem he elsewhere ascribes to one Prodicus, which dealt extensively with the underworld, since all the extant fragments concern characters located in Hades.⁶⁸ Finally, Pausanias (10.31.3–4) contrasted the account of the *Iliad* with the one found in Hesiod and in the *Minyas* (fr. 5 B./W.) regarding the death of Meleager, the hero met in Hades by Theseus and Peirithous.

Two papyrus fragments attest to the reliability of Pausanias regarding the details he mentions: a fragment from the *Catalogue of Women* confirms that, differently from the *Iliad*, in the Hesiodic version Meleager was killed by Apollo (fr. 25.1–14). Furthermore, another substantial papyrus fragment dating from the 1st cent. BC (PIbscher col. I) features a dialogue between Theseus and Meleager in the underworld in the presence of Peirithous, with Meleager telling Theseus of his own death at the hands of Apollo (fr. 280.1–2).⁶⁹ In the remaining text (fr. 280.3–28), Theseus tells Meleager the reason for their descent to Hades, and is asked a question by him regarding Peirithous' former wife. Since, according

⁶⁸ The sources assign the *Minyas* to one Prodicus, either from Phocaea or from Samos; see testimonia 1–4 Bernabé and Janko (2000) 336 n. 1. The possibility that the author of the poem was Chersias of Orchomenus has been vindicated by Huxley (1969) 120; Debiasi (2009).

⁶⁹ On the text of the papyrus see Merkelbach (1950).

to Pausanias' distinct accounts, the episode was narrated both by Hesiod and by the *Minyas*, it is uncertain whether this fragment should be assigned to a Hesiodic *katabasis* of Theseus and Peirithous, or else to the *Minyas*: scholars have accordingly attributed it to either poem, with a marked preference for the *Minyas* (Hesiod fr. 280 = *Min.* fr. 7 dub. B./W.).

And yet, a further argument must be taken into account. Considering the popularity of the *katabasis* theme in archaic and late-archaic Greece, as is shown by a number of poems, from the descent to the underworld of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 11 to the many *katabaseis* of Heracles (cf. Pindar fr. 70b, 346 M.; Bacchylides *epin.* 5), nothing prevents us from assuming that two versions may have circulated relating the same episode, one narrated in a Hesiodic poem distinct from the *Catalogue*, and the other in the *Minyas*; it should be recalled that the Hesiodic version is not contrasted with the poet of the *Minyas*. Indeed, contrary to what is commonly assumed, if a choice needs to be made in assigning the papyrus fragment either to Hesiod or to the *Minyas*, the more likely author is Hesiod, for a strong reason related to the very limited (nearly non existent) number of papyrus fragments of epic poetry (other than the main Homeric and Hesiodic poems) which have turned up in the course of time. Leaving aside the Herculanum papyri of Philodemus' *De pietate* and *De poematis*, which convey a number of quotation fragments from various epic poems embedded in the text of the two treatises,⁷⁰ only one quotation fragment from the *Phoronis* (fr. 6 B./W.) and two small fragments from the beginning of the *Aethiopis* and from a commentary quoting Arctinus have surfaced (= *Aethiop.* fr. 1–2 B./W.).⁷¹ Moreover, it should be noted that none of these fragments represents the direct tradition of the text of the poems, and each direct quotation consists of a few words. The absence of papyrus fragments must be taken as a clear indication that interest in the epic cycle and in other epic poems with a local and antiquarian flavour (such as the *Minyas*) had vanished during the Hellenistic age, and consequently very few copies of the texts were produced (see above, p. 95). Considering the large number of papyri copied through the

⁷⁰ Three fragments are from the *Cypria*, two from the *Titanomachia* and from the *Minyas* (*Titan.* fr. 1, 9 B.; *Min.* fr. 6 B. = Eumelus, fr. 9 W.; *Min.* fr. 6, 8 W.), one respectively from the *Nostoi* (fr. 9 W.), from the *Danaï*s (fr. 3 B./W.), from the *Carmen Naupactium* (fr. 11 B./10 W.), and from the *Europa* of Eumelus (fr. 26 W.).

⁷¹ I am leaving aside the controversial POxy 2510 (= *Il. Parv.* fr. dub. 32 B.), whose attribution to the *Little Iliad* is very doubtful.

centuries that form the bulk of the Hesiodic corpus, it is therefore highly unlikely that a papyrus fragment featuring a long narrative, like P1bscher, belongs to an archaic epic poem rather than to a Hesiodic poem. Once this is acknowledged, the fact that fr. 280 should go under the flag of the Hesiodic corpus does not in the least imply that it was a genuine poem by Hesiod: it simply means that the poem it belongs to was transmitted under the name of Hesiod, and not under the title *Minyas*, and that it may have been independent from the latter.

Precepts of Chiron

Along with the *Great Works* and the *Astronomy*, the Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι (fr. 283–285; see also fr. 321, 323) is another didactic poem attributed to Hesiod in antiquity, until its authenticity was denied by Aristophanes of Byzantium (= T 69). The poem is also mentioned by the few extant sources as παραινήσεις Χείρωνος ἐπὶ διδασκαλίαι Ἀχιλλέως, or simply as Ὑποθήκαι. Its purpose can be traced to the traditional wisdom poetry of the Near East, represented in Greece by the early gnomic poetry of Phocylides (in hexameters) and of Theognis (in elegiac meter). It consisted in imparting to an audience a series of considerations, of advice on all sorts of behaviour, religious and practical, and gnomic utterances, by means of the conventional device of a direct address to a single person within the frame of the father-son relationship, or sage-king, or elder man-younger friend.⁷² A remarkable variation from the usual practice occurred in the Hesiodic poem, insofar as the teaching was imparted by the wise centaur Chiron to the hero Achilles when he was a boy; Chiron was also known as the preceptor of Jason. Along with the admonitions found in the *Works and Days*, the attribution of the poem to Hesiod may have been facilitated by a passage in the *Catalogue of Women* where the absence of Achilles amongst the suitors of Helen is accounted for by the story that at the time he was still completing his training as a young hero on the slopes of mount Pelion, under the guidance of Chiron (fr. 204.87–92). The poem started *in medias res*, with the advice to sacrifice to the gods after coming home (fr. 283): the absence of a proem and of a narrative frame suggests that the *Precepts of Chiron* must have consisted in a loose string of gnomic utterances, rather than display a fully fashioned literary form. An interesting topic, suggesting the practice of literacy, is

⁷² On the poetry of *hypotheke* see Friedlaender (1913); West (1978) 23–25, 33–34.

raised in fr. 285 of the poem, according to which Hesiod stated that children should not be taught the alphabet until they are seven, this being the age when they can begin to study and endure toil.

Great Works

Very little is known of the Μεγάλα Ἔργα, since only two fragments are preserved (fr. 286–287: cf. fr. 322); besides a much debated passage in Athenaeus (8.364B) where it occurs next to the *Great Ehoiai*, the title of the poem is only found in two late sources. Analogy with the couple *Ehoiai*—*Great Ehoiai* suggests that the relation between *Works and Days* and *Great Works* must have been similar: the title implies that the latter was also a didactic poem and dealt with agricultural tasks, and the adjective tells that it was longer than the *Works and Days*. If it incorporated other traditional poetical lore of the same sort as the *Works and Days*, the hypothesis of Marckscheffel ([1840] 89, 188–189) should be recalled, according to whom the *Precepts of Chiron* may have formed, together with the *Ornithomanteia*, a poetic integration which was tagged on the *Works and Days* and went under the title of *Great Works*. The role and function of Chiron as the wise advisor in the *Precepts of Chiron* is paralleled by Rhadamanthys in fr. 286 from the *Great Works*.

Astronomy

Although the existence of a poem under the title Ἀστρονομία is generally accepted, the date of its composition has been much disputed in the past; 19th cent. scholarship favoured a Hellenistic date (after Eudoxos) rather than a 6th cent. date, on the grounds that the subject matter reflected a taste and competence typical of that age, as is shown by Aratus, who is paired to Hesiod in a famous epigram by Callimachus (*Ep.* 27 Pf.).⁷³ The title of the poem, and therefore the notion that there was a specific work dealing with stars and heavens, only rests on two sources: in a long passage derived from Asclepiades of Myrleia (1st cent. BC), Athenaeus says that the *Astronomy* was attributed to Hesiod (fr. 288); Pliny the Elder called it *Astrology* (fr. 290). The few extant fragments (fr. 288–293) mainly deal with the rising and setting of stars and constellations (the Pleiades, the names of the Hyades). No evidence is available that

⁷³ See Marckscheffel (1840) 196, referring to C.O. Müller; Rzach (1912) 1223; for a survey of the debate see Schwartz (1960) 248–252.

the poem also narrated myths related to the stars, unless a few other fragments are taken into account, previously unplaced or assigned to the *Catalogue* (fr. 148a, 149, on Orion, 311 on Phaeton). The paucity of the fragments and the generic references to Hesiod in the sources related to the poem leave open the possibility that, rather than reflect the existence of an independent poem called *Astronomy*, the lines are taken from an expanded version of the *Works and Days*, where astronomical advice is also found.

Ornithomanteia

No fragment is left from the Ὀρνιθομαντεία after it was condemned by Apollonius Rhodius for unspecified reasons (see above, p. 103), although two fragments (fr. 312, 355) may be related to it. Rather than being an independent poem, it probably consisted in a section on divination by birds, a popular topic connected to mantic activity;⁷⁴ it may have been either genuinely Hesiodic, or else it was grafted on to the end of the *Works and Days* at an early period. In the latter case, the insertion was triggered by Hesiod's advice to farmers in the last part of the poem (v. 800–801), that they should 'judge the birds' before choosing the day on which to take home a new wife. The same motif is picked up in the last sentence of the poem, where the capacity of 'distinguishing the birds' is seen as one of the prerequisites for proper behaviour and happiness (v. 826–828).

Idaeian Dactyls

Although the Idaeian Dactyls are rooted in early Greek folklore and myth, the existence of a Hesiodic poem περὶ τῶν Ἰδαίων Δακτύλων is open to doubts, since it is only mentioned by the *Suda*. The two extant reports (fr. 282) refer to the discovery of metals (iron and bronze), revealing the typical Greek penchant for the motif of the πρῶτος εὐρετής. The same story was presented in an antiquarian epic poem, the *Phoronis* (fr. 2 B./W.), where the Idaeian Dactyls are mentioned as attendants of the mother goddess Adrasteia.

⁷⁴ On *oionoskopia* as a skill connected to *manteia* in early epic poetry see Collins (2002).

POETRY AND POETICS IN THE HESIODIC CORPUS*

CHRISTOS C. TSAGALIS

Standing in the enormous shadow cast by Homer, Hesiod has been considered a poet of inferior status from an insignificant Boeotian market town, which he himself describes in negative terms (*WD* 640: Ἄσκραν, χεῖμα κακῇ, θέρει ἀργαλέην, οὐδέ ποτ' ἐσθλῇ). Yet the uncertainty surrounding Hesiod is entirely different in type from that surrounding Homer. In contrast to the external narrator of Homeric epic, who never reveals his identity, Hesiod lavishes his audience with information concerning his own self: his father came from Cyme in Asia Minor (which had been founded by Aeolian colonists), but migrated to Ascra. We also learn of a brother named Perses, who is the constant recipient of advice in the *Works and Days*.

Following Lamberton,¹ I consider that later biographical accounts of Hesiod's life resulting from the overabundance of information in Hesiodic poetry itself aim to promote a historically defined creator on a par with Homer. In this light, Hesiod is used in this chapter to refer to the poetic tradition epitomized in his name, and not to a historical Hesiod, poet of the *Theogony*, the *Works and Days*, and the *Catalogue of Women*. In fact, he "may be considered an idealized creation of the poetry in which he has an integral function—and which he is credited with creating".²

Theogony

Despite being generally treated as simplistic in comparison with Homeric epic, the *Theogony* engages its listeners in a profound game with questions of genre, identity and poetry, as well as singer-audience relations. Given the wide scope of this topic, I intend to focus my attention on three aspects of Hesiodic concern with poetics, namely the acquisition of a

* All translations of Hesiodic passages are those of Most (2006–2007).

¹ See Lamberton (1988) 1–11.

² Nagy (1990b) 52.

distinct generic identity as expressed in the proem, by far the most dense poetological passage of the *Theogony*, the poetic aspirations and Pan-Hellenic scope of this epic as shown in the interpretively arcane Hymn to Hecate, and last—but certainly not least—the interaction between narrator and audience that will be studied under the narratological rubric of “commentary”.

The Proem of the Theogony

The presence of the Muses in the proems of all three main Hesiodic poems indicates that they function as a catalyst in Hesiodic poetry, the more so since the invocation of the Muse(s) is an established theme in archaic Greek epic.³

References to the Muse in the proems of the *Iliad* (1.1), the *Odyssey* (1.1; 1.10) and the *Homeric Hymns to Hermes* (4.1) and *Aphrodite* (5.1) take the form of typical epic invocations. Yet the proem of the *Theogony* (1–115) makes these references more specific and by recording them on the level of divine revelation attempts to link the Hesiodic composition to its divine “hypostasis”, the Muses that inhabit Mt. Helicon.⁴ The regular use of ἄρχομαι (*Th.* 1, *Homeric Hymns to Demeter* 2.1, *to Athena* 11.1, *to Demeter* 13.1, *to Asclepius* 16.1, *to Poseidon* 22.1, *to the Muses and Apollo* 25.1, *to Dionysus* 26.1, *to Athena* 28.1) follows an established pattern.⁵ Yet in essence, in the proem of the *Theogony* it functions in a more elaborate manner. The “substitution” of the hymnic singular (ἄρχομαι) by the plural (ἄρχώμεθα) is no mere detail of grammar.⁶ It suggests that the poet and Muses are to be treated as collaborators, even though the initial relationship between them was probably that of teacher and pupil. The Hesiodic song cannot but begin *with* the Muses, given that it had its beginnings *in* the Muses, who taught the insignificant shepherd the art of song. Manner and causative affinity are treated as identical here, paving the way for the recounting of a metaphorical encounter, which sets out the spatial and temporal boundaries of the Hesiodic poetic journey. From this point of view, ἄρχώμεθα acquires a secondary, figurative meaning

³ For a structural division of the proem of the *Theogony*, see Kambylis (1965) 34–35.

⁴ On the proem of the *Theogony*, see Kambylis (1965) 31–68; Lenz (1980) 123–181.

⁵ Hymn 25.2–5 (*to the Muses and Apollo*) reproduces verses 94–97 of the Hesiodic *Theogony*. The shift from ἄρχομαι to ἄρχωμαι (25.1) is *metri gratia*.

⁶ See the present participle ὕμνεῦσαι, which constitutes an internal indication of the genre of the Muses’ song and the nature of the proem.

in a poem like the *Theogony*, which shows such a keen interest in first beginnings. Thus, an epic on the origins of the gods and the world opens with the staging of poetic genesis, which is, after all, a precondition for its own creation.

The advent of the Muses and ensuing poetic ‘birth’ of Hesiod, squeezed between the two songs of the Muses, act both backwards and forwards within the framework of a tripartite structure. The Muses’ words are presented as embedded secondary focalization. This choice increases their importance, since the process of Hesiod’s poetic initiation (*Dichterweihe*) can be presented not only from the Muses’ point of view (26–28), but also from his own (30–34), as is the case in the second part, which is related in indirect speech through the voice of the primary narrator. The Muses’ words are framed by repeated reference to their divine, in this case Olympian, identity (25), and their descent from Zeus (29). The triple reference to the shepherds (26: ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἴον) shows that Hesiodic epic highlights the distinction between gods and men as the main thematic motif in the process of poetic initiation.⁷ This is indicated by the reproachful tone in the Muses’ words, attributing animal traits to the shepherds. The same intent is clear in the distinction between ἔτυμα (27) and ἀληθέα (28),⁸ which refer to human and divine truth respectively.⁹ In this case, a distinction is not drawn between truth and falsehood, as is the case in the *Odyssey*, but rather between two kinds of truth—the ἀληθέα, eternal truths which lie beyond the restrictive limitations of any sense of time, and ἔτυμα, truths relating to the real world.

⁷ Stoddard (2004) 74–85. The reference to the bellies denotes deception and lies. See Svenbro (1976) 50–59; Nagy (1979) 261 n. 4; Arthur (1983) 102; Pucci (1987) 191–208; Marsilio (2000) 10–13; Murnaghan (2006) 99.

⁸ On the semantic nuances of the terms ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα in Archaic epic, see Krischer (1965) 161–174; Leclerc (1993) 212–221, and Levet (1976) 161 ff., who attributes the sense of conjectured reality to ἔτυμος, and those of seemingly logical and confirmed reality to ἐτεός and ἐτήτυμος respectively.

⁹ With respect to the Muses’ speech, there are three more poetological theories: (a) the Hesiodic tradition uses the terms ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα to invite a striking comparison to Homeric poetry (*Od.* 19.203), see Verdenius (1972) 234–235; Murray (1981) 91; Puelma (1989) 75; Pöhlmann (1989); Arrighetti (1996); (b) Hesiod’s aim was to promote the authenticity of his own theogonic tradition on the basis of verisimilitude, see Stein (1990) 11; Rudhardt (1996) 30; (c) ψεύδεα refer to local versions of the *Theogony* indigenous to particular areas, whereas ἀληθέα point to theogonies known throughout the Greek world, see Nagy (1990b) 44–47. A different view has been put forward by Heiden (2007) 153–175, who has argued that the word ὁμοῖα does not designate resemblance but equivalence and that (171) “the Muses do not blame the poets for telling lies [but] blame the shepherds for not understanding what the Muses’ lies are.”

The second kind of truth (ἔτυμα) appears to be a kind of falsehood since it is prone to constant change. The contrast between truth and falsehood is not absent from the Muses' speech. It is undoubtedly present, yet not dominant, since it is clearly subject to the distinction between human and divine truth that is fundamental to Hesiodic poetry. The arcane tone of the Muses' speech is the hallmark of their divine advent. In combination with another quintessentially enigmatic phrase (35: ἀλλὰ τί μοι ταῦτα περὶ δοῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην;), which follows on,¹⁰ it creates an intentionally opaque framework that serves as a kind of *interpretive guide*: the enigmatic speech of the Muses is consonant with the riddling nature of the beginning of the *Theogony*.¹¹ The cryptic pitch of line 35 does not aim to level the internal semantic distinction between truth and falsehood;¹² on the contrary, it is an attempt to tell the audience to tune in to an interpretive wavelength, which is difficult to locate, yet essential if the Hesiodic *Theogony* is to be fully understood.

This distinction is reinforced by the use of different verb forms for ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα. The verb λέγειν, which is employed in the former instance, merely denotes speech production and not its evaluation, as is the case with the infinitive γηρύσασθαι. By recalling religious language, the latter is imbued with the prestige associated with any theological revelation. ἔτυμα are equal to ψεύδεα, in the sense that they are incapable of expressing the eternal truth because they are subject to the limitations imposed by the evanescent world of mortals. In this conception, despite the fact that line 27 (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα) recalls *Odyssey* 19.203 (ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα) referring to Odysseus' false stories, the Hesiodic line is clearly heading in a distinct semantic direction.¹³

The aorists encountered in the passage on poetic initiation should also be placed within this interpretive framework. The Hesiodic tradition uses a false past tense (such as the aorist) to refer to the perfor-

¹⁰ On the meaning of this enigmatic phrase, see West (1966) 167–169; Hofmann (1971) 90–97; Nagy (1990b) 181–199; Schmoll (1994) 46–52; O'Bryhim (1996) 131–138; Stoddard (2004) 87 n. 57.

¹¹ Stoddard (2004) 84–85.

¹² Pratt (1993) 110.

¹³ Finkelberg (1998) 160 offers a different interpretation of the reference to the Muses' ability to tell "truths similar to lies". According to this view, Hesiod's insistence on the unorthodox presentation of the Muses as divinities who can *also* tell lies arises from his poetic conservatism, since he wished to "preserve" the typologically established conviction that poets were divinely inspired.

mance of the *Theogony* itself. In following Bakker¹⁴ and Stoddard,¹⁵ I believe that the aorists should be interpreted as a mechanism for the creation of *vividness* (ἐνάργεια). By employing them epic poetry presents events belonging to a distant past as if happening right in front of the audience's eyes, at the moment the bard sings them.¹⁶ The aorists do not simply underscore the fact that the Muses are subject to the framework of human time, but also self-referentially project the Hesiodic *Theogony* as the reconstruction of divine advent *par excellence*. The expression νύ ποθ' (*Th.* 22), accompanied by the ensuing (augmented) aorist ἐδίδαξαν, also functions within the same framework for the "remembering" or "calling to memory" of a past event, which comes to life at the moment the *Theogony* is performed.¹⁷ Indeed, the internal *analepsis*, which the expression νύ ποθ' appears to inaugurate in archaic poetry, is virtually nullified in temporal terms and acquires the character of a conjunction, since ποθ' (ποτε) is linked to the narrative present (1: ἀρχώμεθ'). At the moment of its performance, epic poetry thus acquires an almost religious or cultic function, since the Hesiodic *Theogony* recreates the divine advent of the Muses, retrieved from poetic memory and "repeated" in epic time and space, in the *hic et nunc*, in front of a real audience. More specifically, the handling of time is the poetic metalanguage used by the Hesiodic *Theogony* to "translate" divine atemporality or perhaps extemporality into a linear sequence with genealogically organised features relating to descent, thus rendering them both more accessible to human experience and more recognisable to an audience familiarised with catalogue poetry in general. Hesiodic focus is the focus of a mortal "looking" through his narrative lens on the world of the immortals, enabling the human gaze to glance on the atemporal divine horizon.

The Hymn to Hecate

The hymn to Hecate has been the object of extensive research, for scholars have always been intensely preoccupied with a number of primary issues relating to: a) its length; b) its position, by way of an insertion between genealogical catalogues; c) the fact that it is clearly laudatory in nature,

¹⁴ Bakker (2002) 63–81.

¹⁵ Stoddard (2004) 134–135.

¹⁶ Bakker (1999) 50–65, (2001) 1–23.

¹⁷ Stoddard (2004) 136.

albeit for a “secondary” divinity. According to a now virtually abandoned theory that we may call “analytical”, the hymn to Hecate is a later addition to the main corpus of an *Ur-Theogonie*, which, along the lines of the *Ur-Ilias*, would have borne the indelible imprint of its one and only creator, the historically verified Boeotian poet Hesiod.¹⁸ Supporters of the “biographical” theory believe that the hymn to Hecate reflects features relating to the worship of the goddess and Hesiod’s special relationship with it.¹⁹ The religion-based theory proposed by Judet de la Combe²⁰ and Wismann²¹ sees Hecate as a representative of chthonic powers descended from Gaia, while Boedecker²² stresses the triple “functionality” of Hecate (power, strength and productivity), which in some way replicates the three basic functions typical of both the proto-Indo-European religious world and the heroic pantheon. Allied to Boedecker’s latter proposal is Zeitlin’s²³ gender-oriented theory, according to which the main feature of the hymn to Hecate is the way in which it acts as a counterpoint to the myth of Pandora appearing soon afterwards in the narrative course of the *Theogony*. According to another view, the religious dimension of Hecate is textually oriented.²⁴ Clay²⁵ also adopts a textual approach and highlights Hecate’s willingness, which is taken as an attempt at intercession between mortals and immortals, so that the former can gain what they seek from the latter via the process of ritual sacrifice. The poetological approach taken by Griffith,²⁶ and still more that by Nagy,²⁷ marks a turning point in the interpretation of the hymn to Hecate. Griffith argues that Hecate symbolizes the transition from an older to a newer order, with reference to the overall conceptualization of the world as emerging in the Hesiodic *Theogony*. Nevertheless, her role is more a question of poetic taxonomy than of biographical textification. Nagy views Hecate as a “composite” divinity of Pan-Hellenic orientation. Her presence in the *Theogony* is consistent with a conscious attempt by the

¹⁸ Fick (1887) 17; von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1931) 169 ff.

¹⁹ Mazon (1928) 5; Pfister (1928) 8; Aly (1966) 65 n. 23; West (1966) 276–280.

²⁰ (1996) 263–299.

²¹ (1996) 23.

²² (1983) 85.

²³ (1996a) 53–86.

²⁴ Rudhardt (1993) 204–213.

²⁵ (1984) 34–37.

²⁶ (1983) 51–55.

²⁷ (1982) 64.

Hesiodic tradition to broaden the range of listeners interested in a song of such scope.²⁸ This view is also espoused by Stoddard, who is poised between a purely poetological interpretation and a text-centered one.

The present contribution makes use of several of the findings in the aforementioned theories, with the exception of the analytical and biographical ones. Indeed, it may be argued that far from undermining the clear poetological dimension to the hymn to Hecate, Clay's textual interpretation and Zeitlin's gender-oriented approach further reinforce it. The textual interpretation accounts for the position of the hymn, and the gender-oriented and religion-based ones highlight Hecate's relationship to Zeus, yet none offers a convincing explanation for the length or structure of the hymn. Though clearly visible, the poem's Pan-Hellenic orientation must also be linked to a conscious attempt by the Hesiodic tradition to acquire Pan-Hellenic authority. The hymn is an early form of "hallmarking", an internally declared indicator that this particular *Theogony* is *Hesiodic* par excellence. This theory rests on the following evidence: (a) The rhetorical features of ring composition, anaphora and assonance reflect an attempt at the level of diction to lend the hymn a recognizably Hesiodic tone, as is the case with the appearance of similar features in another passage of indisputable poetological hue, the proem of the *WD*. (b) The length of the hymn as well as the fact that it is grafted onto purely genealogical material set out in catalogue form, indicates that the Hesiodic tradition aims at making its own distinct voice heard. In this sense, the traditional genealogical material must be interspersed with something eminently personal and eminently Hesiodic. (c) The use of the name Perses in the *Theogony* for Hecate's father cannot be unrelated to "Hesiod's" brother Perses, the internal addressee in the *WD*. These features indicate that like "Hesiod", so Perses too should perhaps be seen as a textual-poetic mirror inextricably bound up with Hesiodic epic tradition. (d) The reference to ἄεθλα (*Th.* 435–438) indicates a competitive framework, recalling the poetological framework in the *Nautilia* of the *WD*, where there is a specific reference to the poetic triumph won by "Hesiod" at the funeral games in honor of Amphidamas at Chalcis. Hecate is able to stand by and assist those competing, just as the Muses assisted "Hesiod" through the gift of song, thus rendering his victory at the poetic contest at Chalcis possible. (e) The use of vocabulary encountered in poetologically colored passages of the *WD* (such as the proem and the *Nautilia*)

²⁸ See Nagy (1982) 43–73.

highlights its distinctly Hesiodic tone: δυσπήμελος *Th.* 440—*WD* 618, ῥεῖα *Th.* 419, 438, 443, ῥηιδίως *Th.* 442—ῥέα *WD* 5, ῥεῖα *WD* 6, ἀπρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης *Th.* 413—πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης *WD* 648, ἐξ ὀλίγων βριάει καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν μείονα θῆκεν *Th.* 447—ῥέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ῥέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει/ ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἀέξει *WD* 5–6. (f) Lines 445–447 echo the Agriculture section in *WD*, which also contains poetological metaphors.²⁹ (g) The honor³⁰ which Zeus has lavished on Hecate, and her willingness³¹ as regards the benefaction of mortals, may be an indirect encomium for the poetic tradition which reserves a special place for this outstanding goddess. An important poem on the origins of the gods requires important deities, recognisable to the gamut of any potential Greek-speaking audience, since the aim is not a composition of local scope, limited to the confines of Boeotia, but rather a grandiose, Pan-Hellenic composition standing out from all other thematically related theogonic traditions.

Commentary

Narratology has used the term “commentary” to designate those comments made to the audience or readers via the narrative voice of the external narrator, who is the author’s textual representative within the text. Stoddard has argued that the narrator of the Hesiodic *Theogony* uses commentary, i.e. “speech acts that go beyond narrating, describing, or identifying”³² so as to allude to his own persona.³³ According to Richardson,³⁴ this “commentary” may concern both the story and the discourse. One early form of commentary has been termed “explanatory”, used so that the audience can be given information that the Hesiodic narrator knows as a result of his divine inspiration.

An ancient audience would have interpreted the use of name etymology as a sign of poetic authority,³⁵ since etymologizing implicitly evaluates catalogue citation. The use of names in an oral epic composition before a real audience does not have the same function as name citation in

²⁹ Marsilio (2000) 51–52.

³⁰ *Th.* 412, 414–415, 418, 422, 426, 428, 449, 452.

³¹ *Th.* 429–430, 432, 439, 443, 446.

³² Chatman (1978) 228.

³³ Stoddard (2004) 162.

³⁴ (1990) 140.

³⁵ Stoddard (2004) 170–172.

a written text. In summoning various gods and goddesses into the *present* of the performance, it renders them accessible to the audience. The singer shows his listeners that his version of a theogonic song is the most valid one, since it reconstructs for them by means of speech aspects of divine existence. Thus, when we hear that Κύκλωπες δ' ὄνομ' ἦσαν ἐπώνυμον, οὔνεκ' ἄρά σφεων/κυκλοτερῆς ὀφθαλμὸς ἔεις ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ (*Th.* 144–145), we can see that the singer displays his knowledge of the link between signifier and signified, since he explains to his audience that the name Κύκλωπες is a linguistic depiction of an anatomical feature of the Cyclops: the round eye these creatures have on their forehead.

Another form of commentary is the so-called “critical” commentary. In this case “Hesiod” does not address his audience directly, but instead expresses a judgement—hence the term critical commentary—on some character in the plot. This is usually accomplished by means of adjectives.³⁶ In this way, the narrator makes a move towards his listeners: by expressing his personal view, he pre-empts and influences their judgement. Yet at the same time this method attests to the poetological establishment of Hesiodic poetry. Its identity is by now recognisable, the appropriation of epic conventions clear and its personal style well marked. From the undifferentiated citation of elements organized in catalogue form, it moves on to articulate its own distinct voice, which spills over textually into the main narrative, as in the following instructive example (*Th.* 950–955):

Ἦβην δ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱός,
ἷς Ἡρακλῆος, τελέσας στονόεντας ἀέθλους,
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπεδῖλου,
αἰδοίην θέτ' ἄκοιτιν ἐν Οὐλύμπῳ νιφόεντι·
ὄλβιος, ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας
ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἡματα πάντα.

The strong son of beautiful-ankled Alcmene, Heracles' strength, made Hebe, the daughter of great Zeus and of golden-sandaled Hera, his reverend wife on snowy Olympus, after he had completed his painful tasks—happy he, for after having accomplished his great work among the immortals he dwells unharmed and ageless for all his days.

The ‘entry’ Ἦβη in the catalogue of divinities in the *Theogony* is organized in the same way as other lemmata on the same theme, on the basis of her union with Heracles, son of Alcmene. The narrator takes advantage

³⁶ This method is also common in the Homeric epics, the renowned νήπιοι in the proem to the *Odyssey* (1.8) being an early attestation of critical commentary.

of the opportunity offered by the mention of a hero-cum-symbol of the human world in the *Theogony*, a hero who has already been put to use poetologically in the narrative digressions of the passages on the descendants of Ceto and Prometheus. By embedding a personal comment lying outside the plot in the lemma Ἡβη, the Hesiodic tradition leaves its audience with the impression that it has full control of the version being cited; that in reality, what resembles an annotated mythological handbook bears the indelible imprint of a strict choice. In using the epithet ὀλβιος, the Hesiodic tradition looks upon the material being listed in perspective, from the future, as only the creator of the *Theogony* himself could do. In addition, since among the entries dedicated to deities in this section of the *Theogony* this is the only one in which the focus (as emerges from the reference to deification) does *not* concern a female figure, but exclusively a male one (Heracles), it becomes clear that his case is set apart. This differentiation is dictated by the “critical” commentary itself, since the relative clause ὃς μέγα ἔργον . . . ἤματα πάντα (*Th.* 954–955) extends the poetic comment. Furthermore, given that this divergence from the norm is correlated with the particular significance Heracles has in the *Theogony* as a link between the divine and mortal worlds, ὀλβιος acquires an implicit poetological tone.

The third and final category of commentary may be called “interpretive”, since the narrator tries to impose on his audience his own particular interpretation of mythical material. According to Stoddard,³⁷ the section on Typhoeus represents a kind of “interpretive” commentary. The narrator begins by drawing a distinction between the favorable winds (Notos, Boreas, Zephyros) and the destructive ones on the basis of their genealogy, the former being the offsprings of the gods and the latter of Typhoeus. By explaining natural phenomena in terms of divine pedigree as presented in his own theogonic version, “Hesiod” introduces to his audience a world that he alone can know, thanks to his divine authorization by the Muses.³⁸

Apart from the *story*, commentary also concerns the *discourse*. Nünlist and Stoddard have argued that the narrator of the *Theogony* uses direct references to poetic composition itself and to the very performance of the poem. Lines 369–370 of the *Theogony* are a typical case:

τῶν ὄνομ’ ἀργαλέον πάντων βροτὸν ἄνδρα ἐνισπεῖν,
οἱ δὲ ἕκαστοι ἴσασιν, ὅσοι περὶ ναιετάουσι.

³⁷ Stoddard (2004) 170–172.

³⁸ Nünlist (2004) 29; Stoddard (2004) 172.

The names of them all it is difficult for a mortal man to tell, but each of those who dwell around them knows them.

The narrator openly declares his presence by stressing his inability to give the names of the rivers, which represents a typologically established epic technique.³⁹ This is not merely aimed at indirect (in this case unacknowledged) recognition of the Muses' poetic contribution, but rather at the "evaluation of the act of narration itself".⁴⁰ Indirect commentary either on the level of the *story* or on the level of the narrator's art is aimed at the audience.⁴¹ Direct mention of the identity of the audience may be absent, but so is direct mention of the narrator's identity. The approach recommended here is inextricably bound up with the fact that the very performance of heroic song renders direct reference to the audience's identity impossible, precisely because the singer wishes to include many heterogeneous potential audiences in the Pan-Hellenic target of his composition. The only way out available to him is to adopt internal textual conventions reflecting the act of performing theogonic poetry that rests on the narrator-audience-song triptych. With respect to the *Theogony*, these conventions have been internalized into a whole set of narrative rules, the shepherd-poet Hesiod, the advent of the Muses, insistence on relating the immortal world to that of mortals and, finally, apparent inability to recall and present details, which of course only acquires meaning *before* an audience.

Works and Days

The poetics of this undoubtedly multifarious and idiosyncratic work are of equal interest with the "programmatic" epic of the *Theogony*. Poetological signs point in two different but complementary directions: being symmetrically distributed between the two distinct parts this poem is roughly divided into, the mythological and the practical, they aim at placing the *WD* both within the frame of Hesiodic poetry *as delineated by the monumental Theogony* and at determining its special nature within the wider corpus of archaic Greek epic. In this light, I will first deal with sections belonging to the mythological part, such as the proem and

³⁹ See *Il.* 2.488–492.

⁴⁰ Nünlist (2004) 29.

⁴¹ *Pace* Nünlist (2004) 30.

the myth of races, and then with sections pertaining to the “manual of practical advice” such as the Agriculture and Nautilia, where the emphasis is both on the figure of the poet as a skilled artisan and on the nature of Hesiodic didactic poetry as represented by the *WD*.

The Proem of the Works and Days

While not as long as the proem of the *Theogony*, the poetological interest of its counterpart in the *WD* is beyond doubt. Its striking originality lies in the fact that it has two distinct addressees, the Muses (1–2) and Zeus (9–10). The Muses, who are linked to Pieria (*WD* 1: Πιερίηθεν), are the addressees of the opening invocation. The indicative δεῦτε (2) expresses in the most tangible manner the *hic et nunc* of the performance, which is devoted to the praise of Zeus. The reference to the greatest of gods (2: Δι΄—σφέτερον πατέρ’) sets in motion the expansion of the main subject, in accordance with the practice typologically established in Homeric proems.⁴² The internal structure of this reference is contrived with the utmost care. Lines 3–4 are organized around two causal references to Zeus, which open (ὅν τε διά) and round off (4: Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι) the two lines in the form of ring composition. Within this framework, the total dependence of human beings on the god’s power is emphatically stressed, as the preceding statement (3) is followed by a chiasmic pattern (A–: A+ / B+ : B–) which rests on the repetition of the root of the antithetical terms: ἄφατοι: φατοί—ῥητοί: ἄρρητοι. Schematically, the entire distich can be represented as follows:

ὅν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄΦΑΤΟΙ τε ΦΑΤΟΙ τε,
 ‘ΡΗΤΟΙ τ’ ἄΡΡΗΤΟΙ τε Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι.

Through whom mortal men are unfamed and famed alike,
 and named and unnamed, by the will of great Zeus.

The rhetorical sophistication that is a component of hymnic language culminates in the three ensuing lines:⁴³

⁴² I am referring to the modification of the main theme (expressed in the accusative as the subject of the main verb) by accumulation of relative clauses.

⁴³ The various types of characters used here connote correspondences and repetitions, while numbers above lines indicate syntactic similarities further reinforced by syllabic equivalence and symmetrical positioning.

ῥέα μὲν γὰρ ΒΡΙΑΕΙ, ῥέα δὲ ΒΡΙΑΟΝΤΑ χαλέπτει,

ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἄέξει

ῥεῖα δέ τ' ἰθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγήνορα κάρφει

The sequence comprising a four-syllable adjective + a three-syllable verb (4:3 / ἀρίζηλον: μινύθει) and a three-syllable adjective + a three-syllable verb (3:3 / ἄδηλον: ἄέξει) is repeated in almost inverted form in the following line with a three-syllable adjective + a three-syllable verb (3:3 / ἰθύνει: σκολιὸν) and a four-syllable adjective + a two-syllable verb (4:2 / ἀγήνορα: κάρφει). The ring between the beginning (ὄν τε διὰ) and the end (Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι) of lines 3–4 lays the groundwork for the cumulative enumeration of the multiple aspects of Zeus' power. The particular emphasis placed on the ease with which divine punishment is meted out by Zeus (5: ῥέα ..., ῥέα ... / 6: ῥεῖα ... / 7: ῥεῖα ...) is completed in line 8: Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει. Whereas the initial invocation to the Muses probably rested more on its typological foundation than on any organic relationship with the proem of the *WD*, the second address highlights the role of Zeus-sent *justice*.⁴⁴ Last, but certainly not least, the poetic voice is felt in the last line by (a) an emphatically expressed first-person declaration (ἐγώ), (b) an addressee designated by name (Πέρση), and (c) recognisable Hesiodic poetological terms (ἐτήτυμα, μυθησαίμην).

The elaborate construction of this proem compensates for its marked brevity.⁴⁵ Its dual addressees, its studied sophistication, the almost mannerist pursuit of emphatic repetition and architecturally structured contrast, together with the striking first-person declaration of both the poetic *ego* and the internal listener-cum-addressee of the poem, all show that for Hesiodic tradition the proem of the *WD* constitutes the established framework for the pronouncement of its goal.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ This second address, which is accompanied by a paratactic citation of important aspects of Zeus' activity (9: κλυθι ἰδὼν αἰών τε), leads to a narratively defined invocation: δίκη δ' ἰθύνη θέμιστας / τύνη (9–10).

⁴⁵ The term brevity is employed in comparison to the expanded proem of the *Theogony*.

⁴⁶ On the proem of the *WD* (1–10), see Lenz (1980) 182–252, who comes to the conclusion (249) that its aim is to associate the order, justice and decorum symbolized by Zeus with the personal context of Hesiod's life.

The myth of races

In examining the poetics of one of the most famous passages in the *WD*, I shall first discuss the poetological introduction in lines 106–108. After a critical engagement with the theories advanced thus far on the interpretation of the myth of races, I shall explore the kind of intertextual relationship shared by the divine genealogy in the *Theogony* and the human genealogy in the famous myth of races.

The poetological introduction

The poetological reading of the myth of races rests on the three introductory lines, with which the narrator opens his mythological digression:

εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις, ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω,
 εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν,
 ὥς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ' ἀνθρώποι.

If you wish, I shall recapitulate another story, correctly and skillfully, and you lay it up in your spirit: how the gods and mortal human beings came about from the same origin.

From the very outset, the narrator declares his ability to recount a λόγος (106) or didactic narrative. The emphasis placed on the acquiescence of Perses, as recipient of the digression, in hearing Hesiod's λόγος recalls the proem of the *Theogony*, in which the Muses stress their ability regarding the telling of the truth (28). The difference between the two passages lies in the shift of focus from the speaker in the *Theogony* to the listener in the *WD*. In poetological terms, this shift in focus is interpreted as a deviation from the pattern established by the Muses as portrayed in the *Theogony*. Divine speech is by definition authoritative and audience acceptance is taken for granted. In the *WD*, however, Perses as an internal recipient of Hesiodic teaching must be willing to receive the advice and admonitions of the main narrator. By the expression λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω (106) the narrator unreservedly expresses his intention not only to reveal the central theme of the ensuing λόγος but also to bring it to its conclusion.⁴⁷ The expression εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως (107) indicates that, just like the

⁴⁷ See West (1978) 178, and the scholia (106–108 Pertusi): τὸ ἐκκορυφῶσαι δηλοῖ τὸ ἀποκαλύπτειν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄκρην γινώσκειν ἡμᾶς ἀναπέμψαι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως. Δηλοῖ τὸ ἐπαγόμενον.

singer of the *Odyssey*⁴⁸ and the narrator in the *Theogony*,⁴⁹ “Hesiod” in the *WD* will recite a “story” worthy of the audience’s attention. The second, adjunct meaning of the “intra-carminial”⁵⁰ future ἐκκορυφώσω underlines its poetological dimension, since the narrator’s attention focuses on the very moment of performance, by recreating it. Likewise in the ensuing introductory lines of the myth about the hawk and the nightingale, the “intra-carminial” future ἐρέω (202) enunciates the act of narration.

Interpretive approaches to the myth of races

The linear theory adopts a “vertical” reading of the five races, seeing the gold race at the top and the iron one at the lowest point of a literally and metaphorically descending scale.⁵¹ Smith’s psychological theory⁵² argues that each race corresponds to a distinct age in human life, seen in ascending order, from childhood to old age. Attempts to identify Hesiod’s sources (orientalizing theory) began several years ago.⁵³ The fundamental problem lies both in the race of heroes, which is interposed between the four metals, and in the fact that in the *WD*, the myth of races is used in a way that differs radically from Eastern traditions: in the latter, the scale of four metals is used to predict the future, whereas in Hesiodic tradition the same scale, augmented by the race of heroes, is used to organize the past.⁵⁴ Structuralist models mark a turning point, since the myth of races is not interpreted in a linear fashion, but rather on the basis of converging and diverging elements revealed by the analysis of the structure of each race. The first decisive contribution was made by Vernant,⁵⁵ who argued that we are here dealing with six races rather than five, since the last in the chain, the iron race, can be further separated into two races, one of which relates to the present and the other to the future. According to Most’s structuralist model,⁵⁶ the initial Hesiodic five-race division has two distinct levels. The first encompasses a tripartite categorization of the

⁴⁸ See *Od.* 11.368: μῦθον δ’ ὥς ὅτ’ ἀοιδός ἐπισταμένως κατέλεξας.

⁴⁹ See *Th.* 86–87: ... ὁ δ’ ἀσφαλῶς ἀγορεύων / αἰῖρά τι καὶ μέγα νείκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπανσε.

⁵⁰ On the term “intra-carminial” future, see Pelliccia (1995) 317–334.

⁵¹ Meyer (1966) 471–522 = (1924) 15–66.

⁵² Smith (1980) 145–163.

⁵³ See West (1997) 312–319.

⁵⁴ See Smith (1980) 149.

⁵⁵ Vernant (1990) 13–43 = (1985) 19–45 = (1960) 21–54.

⁵⁶ Most (1997) 104–127.

races into (a) gold, (b) silver and (c) bronze, heroic, iron, and the second a four-part classification into (a) gold, (b) silver, (c) bronze and (d) heroic, iron. The tripartite categorization rests on two observations: firstly, Hesiod accompanies the introductory transition to the silver race with the note that “like the golden one neither in body nor in mind” (129: χρυσέῳ οὔτε φῦλιν ἐναλίγκιον οὔτε νόημα), and the respective preliminary reference to the bronze race with the clear statement that “not similar to the silver one at all” (144: ... οὐκ ἀργυρέῳ οὐδὲν ὁμοῖον). Secondly, since no such explicit or latent comment is made on the other three races, it is clear that Hesiodic tradition wishes to distinguish them from the two previous ones. Criteria for setting them apart are their biological make-up, descent and fate after death. The four-part classification rests on the fact that Hesiodic tradition deliberately blurs the boundaries between the heroic and bronze races, the more so since there is no clear explanation of how the latter was created.⁵⁷ Like Vernant’s horizontal structuralism, Most’s “evolutionary” model focuses on the heroic race, but differs from it in the way it sees its function. Setting out from the acknowledgment of the heroic race’s enigmatic eccentricity, which arises from its inclusion in a myth of races of eastern provenance, Most even speaks of the “trapping” of an initial thematic core in the rationale of this particular epic. The greatest contribution made by this model lies both in its functional exploitation of the structural break represented by the heroic race within the continuity of the myth of races, and in its intertextual perspective, according to which the myth of races is incorporated in the wider framework of Hesiodic poetry and is interpreted by comparison with the divine archaeology of the Hesiodic *Theogony*.⁵⁸

Poetics

The heroic race should not be interpreted solely as arising from the pressure exercised by Greek heroic tradition. The way in which it is presented is of vital significance. The insistence on the Theban and Trojan generation of heroes amounts to a statement of poetic beliefs, since

⁵⁷ See Most (1997) 111–113. This interpretive approach allows Most to account for the insertion of lines 173a–e in terms of an attempt by ancient tradition to refer both to the destruction of the heroic race by Zeus and to the creation of the iron race by the same god.

⁵⁸ Most (1997) 127.

through them Hesiodic poetry hints at the respective poetic traditions they emblemize. The unfulfilled nature of Hesiod's wish (174–175) represents an implicit expression of his admiration for the poetic traditions represented by the heroes in Theban and Trojan myth. Beyond the narrative-based interpretation offered by Clay,⁵⁹ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι (175) could indicate Hesiod's desire not to live in a time when evil has dominated the world and no poetic creation has any meaning. In extending Clay's interpretation, we shall argue that Hesiodic poetry offers a poetological filter for the reference introducing the iron race in lines 174–175. It is preferable for a poet either to belong to a great epic tradition such as the Theban or the Trojan one or to live in a time when poetry is entirely absent, rather than to compose poetry about a world in which justice yields to injustice. Rather than undermining or invalidating Clay's text-centered approach, the self-referential dimension of a poetological interpretation actually broadens its scope, by offering an explanation for Hesiodic insistence on interposing the race of heroes in the typologically established "catalogue" of races. Such introspection brings about functional realignments in the roles played by the bronze and iron generations. In the case of the *Theogony*, Hesiodic tradition interrupts genealogically established catalogues relating to the gods so as to lend a particular interpretive tone to its own version. By analogy, whether with its "Eastern" prehistory or its Indo-European counterpart, the myth of races is built on the catalogue substructure that is so familiar in epic poetry. The four-metal race mythological pattern is interrupted by a "Greek interpolation", which differentiates the function of the entire construct. Moreover, the internal breach in the iron race, whether in terms of the temporal bisection proposed by Vernant or the evolutionary dimension offered by Clay, presupposes the crucial role of the heroic race. It is thus no exaggeration to claim that it owes its importance to the fact that it is embedded at precisely this point in the catalogue-shaped myth of races.

Agriculture

One of the most noteworthy forms of metaphor in epic poetry is that concerned with the presentation of the poet as a skilled artisan. Scholars like Schmitt and Campanile have convincingly shown that this attitude

⁵⁹ (2003) 82–83.

towards poetry in fact reflects an old Indo-European tradition. The poet is a τέκτων ἐπῶν and his activity is equal to that of a professional.⁶⁰

In two of the core sections of the *WD*, the Agriculture and the Nautilia, Hesiodic poetry consistently employs poetological metaphors. The Agriculture section (383–617) contains such an extensive network of similarities between the lives of farmer and poet, that certain scholars have suggested a figurative reading of this entire section of the *WD*.⁶¹ By presenting the specialized knowledge possessed by the farmer as analogous to that of the poet and by connecting the skills of both these craftsmen to Zeus, the guiding principle permeating the entire poem, the Hesiodic tradition is able to introduce itself in emphatic manner, likening the poet to a craftsman whose work is familiar to the audience.

The “labor and beggary” sub-section (383–404) begins by determining the right season for undertaking farming activities, such as ploughing and harvesting. The initial phrase Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομένων / ἄρχεσθ’ ἀμήτου, ἀρότοις δὲ δυσσομενάων (383–384) containing the verb ἄρχομαι recalls its programmatic use in the proem of the *Theogony* and the proems of the *Homeric Hymns*.⁶² The poetological function of ἄρχομαι is guaranteed by its traditional referentiality,⁶³ i.e. its metonymic use in epic poetry. Given that the Agriculture section begins in the same way as Hesiodic poetry (*Th.* 1), the “farmer-poet” scenario becomes more likely. Moreover, the disappearance of the Pleiades from the sky for a period of forty days and nights must be interpreted as indicating a negative condition the farmer has to endure until he is allowed to begin cultivating the land.⁶⁴ The farmer is advised to plough the earth after the rising of the Pleiades in the sky, just as Hesiod begins his song only after the divine epiphany of the Muses on Helicon.

The analogy between farming and poetry is also implied by the expressions οὗτός τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος (388) and ἀρχεῖος δ’ ἔσται ἐπέων νομός (403).⁶⁵ Of these two verses the former determines how agricul-

⁶⁰ Schmitt (1967) 295–306; Campanile (1977) 35–54.

⁶¹ On the Agriculture section in Hesiodic poetry, see Tandy and Neale (1996); Nelson (1997); Marsilio (1997), (2000); Tsagalis (2006a) 94–102.

⁶² See above.

⁶³ On traditional referentiality in Homer, see Foley (1991) 6–7; Kelly (2007) 5–14 and n. 20.

⁶⁴ The language of this passage recalls the beginning of the *Theogony*: κεκαλυμμένα ἤέρι πολλῷ (*Th.* 9)—κεκρύφαται (*WD* 386), πρῶτιστα (*Th.* 24)—τὰ πρῶτα (*WD* 387).

⁶⁵ See West (1978) 259, who offers the following parallel passages: *Il.* 20.248–249; *Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 20–21; Pind. *Nem.* 3.82. Agriculture is used as a metaphor for poetry not only in Greek but also in Vedic tradition. See Nünlist (1998) 135.

ture is practiced, whereas the latter refers to Perses' "meadow of words",⁶⁶ which will be completely useless when he (Perses) asks for his neighbours' assistance.⁶⁷ In this way, Hesiodic tradition presents land cultivation (denoted by the former expression) as the antithesis of beggary (delineated by the latter). The language of Perses, his ἔπεα, being that of beggary, will be rejected both by his brother Hesiod (396–397)⁶⁸ and by his neighbours. Being ἀχρεῖος, the "meadow of words" Perses is using will not bear fruit, whereas the undertaking of agricultural work at the right season (394: ὥρι' ἀέξεται) will eventually lead to a decent life. Extending this figurative antithesis further, one may plausibly argue that the πεδίων νόμος in the Agriculture section is a trace of the poetological dialect of the *WD* in epic and didactic disguise.⁶⁹

Furthermore, the Agriculture section displays a special interest in creating an analogy between the literal storing of the harvest by the farmer and the metaphorical "storing" of Hesiod's advice in Perses' mind. This analogy is exemplified by the use of the following terms:

- a. the verb φράζεσθαι is employed both for the advice given to Perses (404: φράζεσθαι χρεῖων τε λύσιν λιμοῦ τ' ἀλεωρήν) and for the advice offered to the farmer (448: φράζεσθαι δ' εὖτ' ἂν γεράνου φωνὴν ἐπακούσεις);
- b. the apostrophe νήπιε/μέγα νήπιε is employed both for Perses (286: σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἐρέω, μέγα νήπιε Πέρση, 396–397: ... ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω / οὐδ' ἐπιμετρέησω· ἐργάζεο, νήπιε Πέρση, 633: ὥς περ ἐμός τε πατήρ καὶ σὸς μέγα νήπιε Πέρση) and for the farmer (456: νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδ' ...);⁷⁰
- c. the verb τίθεμαι is employed not only with respect to Perses (27: ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα τεῶν ἐνικάτθεο θυμῷ) but also in reference to storing at home what is needed for building a carriage (456–457: νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδ'· ἑκατὸν δέ τε δούρατ' ἀμάξης. / τῶν πρόσθεν μελέτην ἐχέμεν οἰκίῃα θέσθαι);

⁶⁶ Note the semantical and aural interplay between νόμος and νομός.

⁶⁷ See Marsilio (2000) 8–9. Murnaghan (2006) 103–104 rightly argues that "by making farming the main subject of his poem, Hesiod enhances his authority as a poet."

⁶⁸ ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω / οὐδ' ἐπιμετρέησω. See also *WD* 648: δεῖξω δὴ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης and *WD* 694: μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι.

⁶⁹ Apart from the 'meadow of words', archaic epic employs two other 'agricultural' metaphors for poetic speech: (a) καρπός and (b) ploughing, sowing or pasturing. For examples, see Nünlist (1998) 135–141.

⁷⁰ On the address νήπιος, νήπιε, μέγα νήπιε in Hesiodic poetry, see Clay (1993) 23–33.

- d. the importance of reciprocity in farming activities (349–350: εὖ μὲν μετρεῖσθαι παρὰ γείτονος, εὖ δ' ἀποδοῦναι, / αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ, καὶ λώιον, αἶ κε δύνῃαι) as well as in recognizing Hesiod's debt to the Muses (656–659: ἄθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος· ἔνθά μέ φημι / ὕμνῳ νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα. / τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσης Ἑλικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα / ἔνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἁοιδῆς) is emphasized.

Finally, another aspect of the poetological connotations of the Agriculture is the cicada imagery (582–584), which employs poetical vocabulary to suggest a double-edged analogy, the positive side of which refers to the Hesiodic poet, the negative side to Perses. Both intratextual associations⁷¹ and intertextual analogies⁷² clearly point to the metaphorical connection between poet and cicada.⁷³ Petropoulos has suggested that this analogy may even, through the notorious laziness and lack of prudence of the cicada, constitute a veiled criticism of Perses.⁷⁴ The cicada passage leads to further considerations concerning the poetics of the Agriculture. Ornithological (γέρανος, κόκκυξ) or entomological (τέττιξ) imagery indicates seasonal change: the crane (448–452) is associated with winter, the cuckoo (486–490) with spring, and the cicada (582–596) with summer time. In addition to the mechanisms used to link these forms of imagery, the activity of these three birds “replays” on the level of poetics what happens with respect to farming as seasons change. Beginning with winter and the crane, moving on to the cuckoo and spring, the internal narrator is clearly heading towards summer and the cicada, whose activity he is willing to assimilate to that of the singer. The selection of summer is not a random choice. It functions as a prophetic advance mention of the analogy that will be suggested in the ensuing Nautilia section between the literal sea journey and the metaphorical sailing on the sea of poetry, activities which must take place in summer time.

⁷¹ See WD 1: ἁοιδῆσι κλείουσαι—583: ἁοιδῆν, 583: λιγυρὴν καταχεύειτ' ἁοιδῆν—659: ἔνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἁοιδῆς, 583: δεινδρὲφ ἐφεζόμενος—593: ἐν σκιῇ ἐζόμενον.

⁷² See WD 582: ἡχέτα τέττιξ—Archilochus 223W: τέττιγος ἐδράξω πετροῦ, Callimachus, fr. 1.29–30 Pfeiffer: τῷ πιθόμῃ]ν· ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ αἰδομένῳ οἱ λιγὺν ἦχον / τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων.

⁷³ See Nagy (1979) 302 n. 11; Rosen (1990) 107–109; Marsilio (2000) 77 n. 113.

⁷⁴ See Petropoulos (1994) 77 n. 29.

Nautilia

The *Nautilia* (seafaring) has gained renown on account of a self-referential poetological mention by Hesiod and a covert acknowledgement of Hesiodic epic. The poet refers to a poetic contest he took part in at nearby Chalkis, where he won a tripod that he dedicated to the Muses on Helicon. The brief reference to Aulis, whence the poet crossed to Chalkis, serves as the springboard for a daring poetological leap: the bay at Aulis is linked to the departure of the Achaeans for Troy to win back Helen, and, as has been argued, by extension to Homeric poetry itself.⁷⁵ Rosen has shown that the passage on seafaring functions as a pictorial triptych (113), in which the first and third parts present mercantile marine activities literally, while the autobiographical *sphragis* elucidates them by means of its poetological function.⁷⁶ Thus the expressions ναυτιλίας δυσπεμφέλου ἕμερος αἶρεϊ (618), μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (648), μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι (694), ἔργων μεμνημένος εἶναι/ὥραίων πάντων (641–642), οὔτε τι ναυτιλίας σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν (649), τόσσόν τοι νηῶν γε πεπείρημαι πολυγόμφων (660), λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' αἰοιδήν (583), λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν αἰοιδῆς (659), the association of literal destitution with poetic poverty (see *WD* 20–26) and the metaphor of the ship and wings (627–629) were cited by Rosen as evidence for an implicit statement on poetics permeating the entire section on seafaring. Both the first and third sections of the tripartite, ring-structure of the *Nautilia*, which contain advice given by the poet to his brother Perses, are didactic in tone and can be subdivided into three shorter parts, which are “interrupted” by the *sphragis* (646–662):

Structure of the *Nautilia*

- A) a. Bad weather: 618–629
 b. Good weather: 630–640
 c. A large cargo: 641–645
- B) *Sphragis*: 646–662
- C) b'. Good weather: 663–677
 a'. Bad weather: 678–688
 c'. A small cargo: 689–694

⁷⁵ Nagy (1982) 66; Hamilton (1989) 69; Tsagalis (2006a) 105–113, *pace* Nicolai (1964) 126–127. West (1978) 55 has argued that the *sphragis* had been initially composed as a poem of the *Nautilia*.

⁷⁶ Rosen (1990) 99–113. See also Tsagalis (2006a) 105–113, (2006b) 232–252, (2007) 269–295.

Trade and Poetry

The emphatic repetition of κέρδος (profit) and φόρτος (cargo) in the Nautilia is indicative of their importance. “Profit” is twice associated with the word “cargo”,⁷⁷ making it clear that any attempt to offer a metaphorical interpretation of the former must rest on the similarly figurative meaning of the latter. In addition to the two cases already mentioned, the word φόρτος is encountered a further three times in the Nautilia, twice as a noun and once as a verb.⁷⁸ With regard to lines 632 and 673, there is a striking insistence on the mention of οἶκος, where Perses must transport his profit or return quickly. In the third case (693), Hesiod is not referring to the sea, but to land transport on a wagon of a load so excessive that the axle breaks and the goods are destroyed. Nevertheless, the expression φορτία μαυρωθείη (693) used to describe the destruction of the cargo is colored by the verb (ἄ)μαυρόομαι, which is encountered twice more in the poem. In *WD* 284 the adjective ἀμαυρός⁷⁹ is used to describe the generation of the perjurer, who is condemned to fall into obscurity and oblivion, in contrast to the generation of the εὖορκος ἀνὴρ, which is termed ἀμείνων (285). Furthermore, in *WD* 325 (ῥεῖα δέ μιν μαυροῦσι θεοί, μινύθουσι δὲ οἶκον) it is clearly stated that the gods can easily bring about the destruction of one who steals or deceives. Indeed, if the phrase μινύθουσι δὲ οἶκον is interpreted as a more specific reference to the divine retribution awaiting the swindler, then the verb (ἄ)μαυρόομαι is being used by Hesiod in both its literal and metaphorical sense. It is worth remembering here that the metaphorical use of the verb is known both from Solon⁸⁰ and from Simonides.⁸¹ Viewed from this vantage point, the metaphorical use of the verb (ἄ)μαυρόομαι points to the metaphorical use of the noun φορτία, which, though referring to a load transported by land, corresponds to the danger of disaster at sea described earlier (687). Dougherty⁸² has convincingly demonstrated that the *Odyssey* insists on appropriating the vocabulary of trade relating to the bipolar opposition of profit and deceit, so as to accord a positive evaluation to Odysseus’ song and a negative one to that of the swindler

⁷⁷ Κέρδος—φόρτος: *WD* 631–632, *WD* 644–645.

⁷⁸ *WD* 672 (φόρτος), *WD* 693 (φορτία), *WD* 690 (φορτίζεσθαι).

⁷⁹ *WD* 282–285.

⁸⁰ 4.34 West: τραχέα λειαίνει, παύει κόρον, ὕβριν ἀμαυροῖ.

⁸¹ 531.5 *PMG*: ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὐτ’ εὐρώς/οὐθ’ ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.

⁸² Dougherty (2001) 38–60.

poets.⁸³ Odyssean insistence on economic and trade imagery branches off in the presentation of a model of mutual generosity linked to the aristocratic ideal of gift exchange on the one hand, and the unilateral threat to stable economic activity posed by piracy on the other. Just as in the *Odyssey* and in Pindar,⁸⁴ Hesiodic poetry uses trade imagery as the vehicle expressing poetic competition. The metaphorical function of the word φορτίον, as intimated by the use of the verb (ἄ)μανυρόομαι, recontextualizes the meaning of profit and stresses the difference between a large vessel and a small one, and thus between a large and a small cargo.⁸⁵ Within this framework, it is suggested that just as a large ship capable of bearing a large cargo is a necessary precondition for acquiring a large profit, so a grandiose epic composition is necessary for acquiring poetic fame. Hesiod appears to prefer a small ship,⁸⁶ for all the profit to be gained by a large cargo.⁸⁷ Later, in the third part, he advises his brother to load only a small portion of his goods on ship, leaving the greater part behind.⁸⁸ With these instructions to poetic seafarers, Hesiod won the poetic contest at Chalkis with the less ambitious composition of the *Theogony* (655: πολλά).

The ring-composition structure of this section reinforces and further specifies the cargo-metaphor: the small ship symbolizes a short epic composition that will offer a small but safer profit, while the larger ship denotes a large epic, i.e. Homer, which may bring the poet great glory but is fraught with inherent risks. In this light, Hesiod leads us both into the world of poetry by means of the word φορτίον, and into the realm of poetic reward via the expression κέρδος ἄρῃαι, which depends for its interpretation on the metaphorical φορτίον (cargo). The findings of historical linguistics confirm that the association of profit with poets and poetry was initially taken for granted. According to Watkins⁸⁹ and Campanile,⁹⁰ in Celtic and more specifically Welsh tradition, the term equivalent to the Greek word κέρδος is rendered in the form *cerdd*, which means *work* and *profession* in general as well as *poetic work*, *poetry* and *music*. In Greek poetic tradition, especially though not exclusively in

⁸³ See *Od.* 11.362–369.

⁸⁴ Pind. *Pyth.* 2.62–68; *Nem.* 5.1–6.

⁸⁵ *WD* 643–645.

⁸⁶ *WD* 643: νῆ' ὀλίγην αἰνεῖν.

⁸⁷ *WD* 644: μείζων μὲν φόρτος, μείζον δ' ἐπὶ κέρδεϊ κέρδος.

⁸⁸ *WD* 689–690: μηδ' ἐν νηυσὶν ἅπαντα βίον κοίλῃσι τίθεσθαι, / ἀλλὰ πλέω λείπειν, τὰ δὲ μείονα φορτίζεσθαι.

⁸⁹ Watkins (1995) 76.

⁹⁰ Campanile (1977) 37.

Pindar's epinicians, poetry is metaphorically presented as "redemption from a financial obligation or debt."⁹¹ Returning to Hesiod, we see that the resemblance of κέρδος ἄρῃαι (WD 632) to its Homeric equivalent κλέος ἀρέσθαι and its formulaic allomorphs εὖχος, κῦδος ἀρέσθαι suggests that a distinct poetic voice begins to emerge in the disguise of an extended metaphor, proposing a new kind of poetic gain: no longer the Homeric κλέος, εὖχος or κῦδος but the κλέος of Hesiodic poetic composition, humbler but just as inspired as its Homeric counterpart.

A comparison between the Hesiodic *sphragis* (WD 646–662) with *Odyssey* 8.159–164 shows that Hesiodic poetry introduces a new, more complex interpretation of the word ἄεθλα/ἄθλα. Just as Odysseus is compared to a seafarer who attends both to the cargo he is transporting and to easy profit, so in the WD, Perses must attend to seafaring (642–643) and also to the cargo he is transporting. Yet immediately thereafter, that same cargo becomes metaphorical, as Hesiod's poetic output and the ἄεθλα/ἄθλα are not war or athletic competitions but rather poetic contests. Nevertheless, the latter are colored neither by the aristocratic ideal of reciprocity nor by the rapacious greed of deceit, but instead by the wisdom and knowledge of mercantile success, the reaching out of poetic creation to a wider public, no longer in miserable Ascra but in Chalkis, the metaphorical gate to poetic fame. Hesiod's poetic contests and the prizes awarded for his victory call for the mind of a sea trader who, aware of the "metra" of seafaring, will escape successfully to sail the sea of poetry. Comparison of the way in which the *Odyssey* and Hesiod's *Nautilia* present maritime trade determines the frequency we must tune into if we are to apprehend the extent of Hesiodic emancipation from Homeric tradition. The *Odyssey* capitalizes on the contrast between two distinct variants of nautical activity, which are epitomized by two seafaring communities, the Phaeacians and the Phoenicians. According to Dougherty,⁹² these communities share certain traits, such as impressive wealth accumulation and remarkable proficiency in weaving, ships and maritime activity in general. Nevertheless, the two peoples can be radically differentiated with regard to the way in which they conduct trade. The *Odyssey* even presents the Phaeacians and Phoenicians as occupying diametrically opposed positions, since the former do not engage in profit-making activities, despite the fact that they are excellent sailors, while the latter are famed merchants and gifted sailors. The Phaeacians

⁹¹ See Nünlist (1998) 284–290.

⁹² Dougherty (2001) 102–121, and especially 112.

inhabit an imaginary world, where the everlasting fertility of the earth and the bounty of agricultural produce enable them to practise almost altruistic gift exchange, while the Phoenicians have turned to merchant marine activity by force of need. According to Dougherty, the *Odyssey* “attempts to carve out a position for the Greeks somewhere between the idealized model of gift exchange represented by the Phaeacians and the negative image of trade as a kind of piracy projected by the Phoenicians.”⁹³ Comparison of maritime activity as presented by the *Odyssey* and Hesiod reveals that the *WD* renegotiate the middle ground which the *Odyssey* reserves for Odysseus himself and, through him, for the Greeks. In the *WD*, however, the middle ground is defined as a personal difference between two brothers, Hesiod and Perses. While the *Odyssey* mingles Phaeacian and Phoenician traits together in the multifaceted personality of Odysseus, the *WD* deliberately engage in the projection of a dynamic correspondence between productive work and well organized maritime trade on the one hand, and idleness and risky profiteering on the other. In addition, in the *WD* Hesiodic poetry takes further advantage of this thematic outlook, using it as both a starting point and a pretext for poetological reflection stemming from the creative appropriation and transcendence of the *Odyssey* tradition. In my view, the interpretation proposed here is lent further support by the reference to the award bestowed on Hesiod in lines 656–659. As a symbol of athletic triumph victors dedicated wreaths to their cities, which would accord them protection of sorts, as an almost magical deterrent against danger. In the same way, Hesiod dedicated the tripod he won at the poetic contest in Chalkis to the Muses on Helicon who first taught him the art of song. Kurke⁹⁴ has argued that *κῦδος*, as projected in Pindar and Bacchylides’ epinician odes, is a political adaptation of its Homeric predecessor, whereby the city takes the place of the Homeric king who received the victor’s glory. As for the Hesiodic *sphragis* relating to the bestowal of an award on the poet at Chalkis, athletic terminology (*ἄθλα, νικήσαντα*) and dedication of the tripod to the Muses are framed by seafaring and mercantile metaphors. To paraphrase the title of the aforementioned article by Kurke, the Nautilia is transformed into the *symbolic economy of Hesiodic κλέος*.

Just as maritime trade, i.e. trade competition, yields profit, so poetic competition yields poetic profit. The twofold meaning of *ἄθλα*, which

⁹³ Dougherty (2001) 112.

⁹⁴ Kurke (1993) 137–138.

designate both poetic contests and the victor's prize, makes the games in honor of Amphidamas at Chalkis the perfect occasion for Hesiodic poetry to promote its output and become known to a public different from that in insignificant Ascra. Recently, Clay⁹⁵ has persuasively argued that Hesiod's autobiographical references are metaphorical rather than literal, and that the reference to Cyme as the homeland of Hesiod's father may reflect an attempt to downplay Hesiod and Homer's common descent (according to Herodotus' life of Homer), in order to promote their subsequent differentiation within the framework of epic poetry. In this conception, the entirely negative presentation of Ascra should be interpreted in terms of poetic metaphor rather than historical geography. In mapping out the dangers of his poetic isolation, Hesiod is attempting to make his poetry reach out to a wider public. Ascra and Chalkis, or poetic isolation and the publicization of his poetry, may constitute the two poles of Hesiodic poetic topography, which itself knows of "well-bolted" (πολύγομφοι) ships and the "metra" of the wild sea, i.e. it knows—*more hesiodeo*—how to sail the sea of Archaic epic. In this light, the following poetic strategy, as argued by Obbink,⁹⁶ becomes very important:

In the archaic and early classical period such extreme *sphragidization*, which we may define as the embedded assertion of the identity of the poet with his narrative persona, betrays anxieties over the ownership of poetry and its status as property. The introduction of addressee(s) is one way in which the relationship between the poet and his audience may be articulated or negotiated, in such a way that a poet nominally retains control over the poem as created artifact, but initiates its transfer to a general audience through the mediation of an elite exclusive addressee.

In this light, the property dispute is no more real than Hesiod himself and Perses, who are mere masks behind which Hesiodic tradition, appropriating contemporary epic and lyric conventions, reveals its character, public and goal. To my mind, the Hesiodic poetic tradition of didactic epic fabricated the property dispute with an "intimate" addressee, Perses, in order to renegotiate its relationship with its audience. The "brother" relationship between Hesiod and Perses is a functional analogy serving the poetry's admonitory nature. Other noteworthy examples of addressees are Cynus in the corpus Theognideum, Pausanias in Empedocles, Theodorus in Dionysius Chalkous, and Moschus in Arcestratus

⁹⁵ Clay (2003) 181.

⁹⁶ Obbink (1993) 79 n. 61.

of Gela.⁹⁷ Typically, the preference is for an addressee of equal status to the person offering advice. In contrast to Eastern poetic traditions, in which the addressee is usually the son of the counselor, the above examples show that the choice of equal status for the person acting the role of advisor or teacher is of crucial significance in didactic poetry. This interpretation is further strengthened by the fact that Hesiod's apparently different poetic personae as an advisor or judge in the *WD* and as eulogist of the divine world in the *Theogony* are interconnected by his self-presentation as an immigrant. Martin⁹⁸ has rightly argued that Hesiod's autobiographic references in the *WD* (whether they concern the poet himself, his father or his brother Perses), certain distinguishing features of his dialect (such as a number of aeolisms), the tendency to use maxims and, finally, the preference shown for rare words over more common ones (ἀνόστεος, φερέοικος)⁹⁹ should be evaluated in relation to the audience he is targeting. Hesiod is presented as a foreigner offering advice precisely because he is thus more likely to persuade his audience. The didactic character of this poetry "necessitates" the creation of particular "textual" conditions for the articulation of its respective message. By fabricating a brother, Perses, instead of a son to whom its *didache* would be addressed, Hesiod disposes of the typical opposition between teacher and student, father and son or older and younger precisely because the position from which he wishes to speak is that of a wandering bard,¹⁰⁰ and not that of an old sage. In adopting the wisdom of an immigrant, Hesiod and his tradition are in a position to tune the audience to their own particular note, and lay claim to the success of their admonitory teaching.¹⁰¹

The Catalogue of Women

One of the most fascinating aspects of the *Catalogue of Women* (hence *CW*) is closely connected to its nature as a catalogue, which becomes all the more significant given the catalogue-form of a large part of the

⁹⁷ On the function of a poetic *sphragis*, see Kranz (1961) 3–46 & 97–124.

⁹⁸ (1992) 11–33.

⁹⁹ On Hesiodic "Riddle-Words" (*Rätselwörter*) in the form of *Kennings*, see Troxler (1964) 21–28. On *Kennings* in general, see Waern (1951).

¹⁰⁰ Wanderers are associated with both truth and lies. See Montiglio (2005) 91–100. Murnaghan (2006) 99 observes that "wanderers have access to information that is beyond the purview of their audiences because it is removed in space or even other-worldly".

¹⁰¹ See Martin (1992) 11–33.

Theogony. Recent studies on the *CW* have rekindled interest in the reconstruction and function of this work within the Hesiodic corpus. In the case of the *CW*, more than in any other poem of the archaic period, reconstruction and interpretation represent complementary philological desiderata, since the way the *CW* is structured is directly linked to the way it has been structured, to the process through which it has come into being. By extension, the formation and shaping of the *CW* is relevant to its place within Hesiodic poetics as a whole.

The Hesiodic Nature of the Catalogue of Women

The *CW* aims at presenting a Pan-Hellenic overview of the Heroic Age, spanning a large part of the Greek world. If we adopt West's fourfold organization of the genealogical material, reflected in Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*, then we can see that the world of heroes is presented through a progression from the very beginnings of the world of mortals to the heroic age. In this respect, the *CW* shows itself to be strongly Hesiodic, in that it abides by the built-in linearity characteristic of the genealogical Hesiodic epic par excellence, the *Theogony*.¹⁰² In fact, the *CW* presupposes knowledge not simply of theogonic material but the Hesiodic *Theogony* itself.

As early as the proem of the *CW* the audience is invited to enter the performance at the very point it left when the *Theogony* came to completion (*Th.* 1021–1022 = *CW* 1–2). At the same time, much of what is said before the invocation to the Muses is recapitulated (*CW* fr. 1.9: τῶν ἔσπετε Μ[οῦσαι]) does not recall any particular passage of the *Theogony* but partly¹⁰³ what is said about the race of gold in the *WD*. The last part (vv. 10 ff.) of the proem¹⁰⁴ is in bad shape but the order of divine names, which we can still discern, “seems to correspond to the

¹⁰² See West (1985) 125–130. Osborne (2005) 8 n. 4 disconnects this issue from the problem of dating the three major Hesiodic poems.

¹⁰³ The heroes sit next to the gods and feast with them, but some of them seem to age, unlike their counterparts in the golden race. See Clay (2005) 26–27.

¹⁰⁴ The proem of the *CW* has a tripartite structure: (a) vv. 1–2: first invocation to the Muses; (b) an extended description of the subject matter of this epic, initiated by a relative clause and accumulating information that is organized in parataxis (very much in the manner of the proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*); (c) recapitulation of the initial invocation (see *Od.* 1.1 and 1.10) and determination of a starting point (*CW* 16: πρῶτα, see *Il.* 1.6).

gods enumerated in the list contained in vv. 930–961 of the *Theogony*.¹⁰⁵ In this conception, the poem of the *CW* shows itself to be truly Hesiodic, in the sense that it forms integral part of an unattested Hesiodic Cycle of epic poetry, whose “each individual section both mirrors the theme of the whole and goes into making it”.¹⁰⁶

The Prometheus and Pandora episodes form a bridge that links the three principal epics of the Hesiodic corpus, the *Theogony*, the *WD*, and the *CW*. However, the function, size, and placement of these two episodes reveal a significant shift of emphasis and scope. Whereas in the *Theogony*, the reference to Pandora is basically subordinated to an entire mythical episode featuring Zeus and Prometheus as its protagonists, in the *WD* the Prometheus episode functions as a prelude to the larger and more important Pandora episode that follows. In the *Theogony*, the Prometheus episode is narrated *retrospectively*, i.e. *after* the Hesiodic narrator has told his audience about the punishment of Prometheus and his salvation by Heracles. Conversely, the *WD* follow a linear unraveling of the story, but they pick up the Prometheus episode only *after* Zeus has discovered that he has been deceived, at the point where he informs the arrogant descendant of Iapetos that he, together with mortal men, will be punished. Whereas in the *Theogony* it is the Prometheus episode that looms large, in the *WD* it is the story of Pandora. In addition, although both epics seem to use these episodes in order to highlight the fact that Zeus cannot be deceived (*Th.* 613, *WD* 105), the *WD* problematize the power of *logos*, since there is an incongruity between Zeus’ orders and their execution by various gods.¹⁰⁷ In the *CW*, the Prometheus and Pandora references are not presented separately but as a foil for the generation of the first mortal couple, Deucalion and Pyrrha. Once the transition from the theogonic environment to the mortal world is effected, the *CW* moves on to Hellen whose three sons (Doros, Xouthos, and Aiolos) represent the beginnings of the Greek heroic world. With respect to placement, and if we treat the three major Hesiodic works as parts of a whole, we may observe a *regressive tendency*, according to which Prometheus and Pandora (who always appear together in the Hesiodic corpus) are placed closer to the beginning of the epic as we move from the *Theogony* to the *WD* and then to the *CW*. In particular, whereas in

¹⁰⁵ Clay (2005) 27. The first who made this observation was Treu (1957) 173 n. 8.

¹⁰⁶ Nelson (2005) 334.

¹⁰⁷ On this issue, see Robert (1914) 28; West (1978) *ad* 73–75; Clay (2003) 122 n. 56; Tsagalis (2006b) 191–193; Wolkow (2007) 247.

the *Theogony* the two episodes are placed in the second part of the poem, in the *WD* they are located roughly at the beginning of the mythical first part, and in the *CW* right after the proem. By dint of these observations, it can be plausibly argued that the sequence of the Prometheus and Pandora references mark the *CW* as a Hesiodic composition par excellence.

Likewise, Heracles is not just a mythical figure but also a device underlying the Hesiodic nature of the *CW*. The reversal of the chronological order of the events pertaining to his life (since his death precedes his birth) has been explained as “a move from the cosmogonic to the heroic: the life of Heracles provides a link between the two, with his death a part of the ordering of the cosmos and his labors belonging to the realm of the heroic.”¹⁰⁸ By juxtaposing the birth of Heracles with the beginning of the Trojan War, the *CW* brings the theogonic cosmogony to an end and makes the transition to the heroic world. Heracles is, therefore, transformed into a figurative linchpin that stitches together the divine cosmos and the world of heroes.¹⁰⁹ Given that Hesiodic poetry at large stands in stark contrast to the narrative seamlessness of Homeric epic,¹¹⁰ the audience is thus reminded that the *CW* is not a series of human genealogies but a prismatic, sophisticated narrative with multiple temporalities, voices and registers¹¹¹ and a distinct and recognisable Hesiodic tone.

Genealogical Organization and Lemmatization

The *CW* displays a complex structure, which consists of an external geographical organization with genealogical material that is fused with non-genealogical lemmata. This conflated form of genealogical material, which has been *thematically* organized in cycles but *dictionaryally* in lemmata introduced by the *ehoie*-formula, results in the disruption of narrative linearity and creates “ruptures in the chronological fabric of the story.”¹¹² The ἦ οἴη-formula is an elliptical expression employed to introduce a story or a genealogy. It seems that it is a relic of an older epic phase, in which it functioned as an “oral lemma” within a series or chain of women stories.¹¹³ Its use of the *ehoie*-formula has been aptly

¹⁰⁸ Fletcher (2006) 3.

¹⁰⁹ See Haubold (2005) 95–98.

¹¹⁰ Nelson (2005) 333–335.

¹¹¹ Haubold (2005) 96–98.

¹¹² Haubold (2005) 96.

¹¹³ See Hirschberger (2004) 30.

called “resumptive-progressive”,¹¹⁴ so that the poet can “leap back from the end of the branch of the genealogy to a higher point in an earlier one.”¹¹⁵ In fact, the *CW* exhibits a tension between the *ehoie*-formula and a larger genealogical superstructure. This tension consists of two opposing forces, a centripetal one that is expressed by the genealogical framework, and a centrifugal one indicated by the *ehoie*-formulas. These antithetical forces may stem from the fusion of two preexisting genres, genealogical poetry and non-genealogical catalogues of women using the *ehoie*-formula. According to Rutherford’s analysis, the *ehoie*-formula is nothing more than a “vestigial” element within the overall organization of the *CW*.¹¹⁶

The particular way various genealogies are presented in the *CW* is the result of conflation of material stemming from local genealogies (with the exception of the Pelasgid and Attic stemmata) with material created as a result of tendencies of expansion and interpolation, which exercised their influence on the older genealogical substratum either because there was a need to incorporate additional territories and/or because specific political interests had to be catered for.¹¹⁷

Given that the *CW* seems to follow a geographical progression from western to eastern Greece, the use of a “para-Hesiodic” tradition such as the *ehoie*-formula may have originated, according to West, in a place where the Deucalionid stemma, which abounds in *ehoiai*, is particularly prominent, i.e. North-West Greece/Western Peloponnese.¹¹⁸ It is in that region that its first phase can be located and it seems a plausible hypothesis that it originated from East Locris, an area with strong genealogical background and a matrilinear system of inheritance. West postulates a final but formative stage in the encyclopaedic shaping of the *CW* as we have it, a stage particularly connected to Attica.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁴ Rutherford (2000) 83.

¹¹⁵ Rutherford (2000) 83.

¹¹⁶ Rutherford (2000) 93.

¹¹⁷ See West (1985) 164–165.

¹¹⁸ West (1985) 166–168.

¹¹⁹ West (1985) 168–171. Cf. Fowler (1998) 1–19, who argues that the *CW* presupposes knowledge of the political situation of the Delphic Amphictyony in the early sixth century BC; Hirschberger (2004) 32–51 places the composition of the *CW* between 630 and 590 BC.

Typology: Form, Content, Narrative

The CW displays a number of typical features with respect to its form, the more so since it represents “the culmination of a tradition of catalog poems”. Before determining and discussing in brief some of these formal characteristics, a necessary *caveat* should be taken into account: given our limited knowledge of this genre as a whole, it is likely that some of these features do not pertain to the “deep structure” of the genre but are concomitant with catalogue-poetry in its broader sense.

The CW systematically assigns names, often not distinctive, to female figures.¹²⁰ It is not at all rare to find in the CW the names of women who feature in myths known from other sources but are not named there.¹²¹ The fact that these names are always specified indicates not only that they are not important *per se* but also, and perhaps preeminently, that the pressure of the genealogical background of this genre is so strong that it almost “requires” specification of names. Sometimes aesthetic purposes are at work, as is the case with the colorless Clidanope, whose artificial name “serves only to make a genealogical link.”¹²² With respect to names embedded in lists, usually one- or two-verse long, certain phonological factors pertaining to the surface features of epic song (rhythm, alliteration, assonance, formulaic nature of epic diction) exercise their own influence in selecting and assembling a group of names within a given chunk of verses. Associative and semantic prompts must be also taken into account, but they are significantly harder to determine. Given that they are relevant to place-names, not just personal ones, and that the CW has a strong geographical aspect, I will deal with them when I discuss the performance context and function of this epic. As far as phonological devices with respect to the selection and order of personal names are concerned, I have detected the following sound patterns:

- (a) word-initial assonance (fr. 33(a) 9):

Εὐαγόρην τε καὶ Ἀντιμένην καὶ Ἀλάστορα [δῖον]¹²³

- (b) word-terminal assonance (fr. 25.19):

Ὕλλον καὶ Γλήνον καὶ Κτήσιππον καὶ Ὀνειτήν

¹²⁰ Lyons (1997) 54; Rutherford (2000) 83.

¹²¹ Lyons (1997) 54.

¹²² West (1985) 88. I owe this reference to Lyons (1997) 54.

¹²³ On stock names like Ἀλάστωρ (Avenger) stemming from war epic traditions (see *Il.* 4.295; 5.677; 8.333) and their pragmatic use in list-making, see Minchin (2001) 83.

- (c) a + b combined (fr. 33(a) 11):

Δηΐμαχόν τε] καὶ Εὐρύβιον κλειτόν τ' Ἐπίλαον

- (d) verse-initial word-terminal + verse-internal word-terminal assonance (fr. 25.15–16):

Φηρέα θ' ἱππόδαμ[ον καὶ ἐνυμ]μελίη[ν Ἀγέ]λαιον

Τοξέα τε Κλύμενό [ν τε ἄνακ]τ' ἀτάλαντ[ον] Ἀρηϊ

- (e) verse-internal word-terminal + verse-terminal word-terminal assonance (fr. 33 (a) 11–12):

Δηΐμαχόν τε] καὶ Εὐρύβιον κλειτόν τ' Ἐπίλαον

Νέστορά τε Χ]ρομίον τε Περικλύμενόν τ' ἀγέρω,χον

- (f) three-step progressive syllable increase (fr. 23 (a) 5):

Λήδη [τ' Ἀλθαίη τε Ὑπερμήστρη τε βοῶπις

Similar sound-patterns have been discerned in lists and catalogues attested both in Homeric poetry, such as, *inter alia*, the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.494–759; 2.819–877), the Catalogue of Nereids (18.39–48), and the list of Phaeacians (*Od.* 8.111–114), and in the Hesiodic *Theogony*, in which one can find abundant examples of list-making.

Paratactic structure is a general feature of archaic epic and so its pre-eminent use in the CW should not be considered a typical characteristic of this genre. On the other hand, the built-in paratactic structure of catalogue-poetry stems from the fact that every item and entry is treated as of equal importance by the tradition and that information is assessed through a process of “replaying a single event or action.”¹²⁴ In this conception, *parataxis* facilitates the processing of high-density data and counterbalances the lack of a sequence of events, as found in the case of regular narrative.

Some *ehoiai* have a tripartite structure: (a) in the first part (“presentation/*Vorstellung*”) the main female character is introduced; (b) in the second (“procreation myth/*Zeugungsmythos*”) the narrative concerning the love-story of a god with a mortal woman is unraveled;¹²⁵ (c) and in the third and final part descendants (“offspring/*Nachkommenschaft*”) are

¹²⁴ Minchin (2001) 79.

¹²⁵ Davies (1992) 7 suggests that an elaboration may increase to such an extent that “it overwhelms the catalogue format”, when a story “grows in length and involvement [and] the emphasis changes from each entry as a part of the whole catalogue to each entry as a self-contained unit.”

named.¹²⁶ Since this structure, which is often reshaped and modified, represents a typical structural principle followed in Greek epic of the archaic period, we do not know whether it belongs to the “deep structure” of *ehoiai* poetry, even though it is also observed in Homeric, not only, Hesiodic *ehoiai*.¹²⁷

Recurrent formulas attested in the *ehoiai* are: ὑποδμηθεῖσα (“subdued [in marriage]”) and ὑποκυσσάμενη γείνατο/τέκε (“after conceiving she begot”), λέχος εἰσαναβάσα (“[she] is going up into [somebody’s] bed”), and ἵπποισιν τε καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσι (“[lead off to marriage with a dowry of] horses and closely-joined chariots”), ὑπέσχετο μυστρία ἔδνα (“innumerable wedding gifts promised or offered”).¹²⁸ Other recurrent dictional features include the following: a praising epithet referring either to female beauty or chastity or to the children a mortal woman begets to a god (e.g. Μῆστορη ἐνπλόκαμος [43a.4 M.-W.], παρθένος ἀδμής [59.4 M.-W.],¹²⁹ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα [31.2 M.-W.]), and the separation of divine from mortal children, who are introduced by the expression τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους ... [τέκ’] (25.14 M.-W.). These characteristics are all related, directly or indirectly, to the themes of marriage and lovemaking, which are frequently attested in the CW.¹³⁰ The language of the CW, at least with respect to women, is traditional. Although most of the epithets used to modify a female figure are also attested in Homeric and Hesiodic epic as well as the *Homeric Hymns*,¹³¹ there is evidence showing that new combinations¹³² of traditional elements do occur and new phrases¹³³ are created by analogy. Cohen, who has studied the “female language” of the CW, has argued that in the case of women who are also known from early epic poetry the poet of the CW “appears to be more specific and

¹²⁶ I owe the German terms to Trüb (1952) 54.

¹²⁷ See Trüb (1952) 53–54.

¹²⁸ Fr. 43a21.

¹²⁹ See Hirschberger (2004) 336.

¹³⁰ Trüb (1952) 52–53; see also Rutherford (2000) 83 and 264 n. 10 for a complete list of relevant attestations.

¹³¹ See Cohen (1989) 16–20.

¹³² Fr. 30.25 (M.-W.): Τυρὼ ἐνπλόκαμος ἐκέλη χ[ρ]υσῆι Ἀφροδ[ι]τ[η]. ἐκέλη χρυσῆι Ἀφροδίτῃ is used in Homer with respect to Briseis (*Il.* 19.282), Cassandra (*Il.* 24. 699), and Penelope (*Od.* 17.37 with an internal expansion that includes Artemis). For more examples see Cohen (1989) 21.

¹³³ Frs. 73.3 (Atalante), 43a.4 (Mestra), 196.6 (Helen): Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματ’ ἔχο[υ]σα seems to have been created by analogy on the basis of Χαρίτων ἀπο κάλλος ἔχουσα (fr. 215.1–2 with respect to Cyrene) and *Od.* 6.18 (referring to Nausicaa’s maids). For more examples see Cohen (1989) 22.

rather more expansive”¹³⁴ because he wants to emphasize the fact that “it was women *such* as these who attracted the amorous attention of the gods.”¹³⁵

Given that the ἡ’ οἷη formula has been treated above, I will now discuss only certain aspects of its function that have not been previously dealt with. West contends that the ἡ’ οἷη formula with its “disjunctive” nature presupposes an initial paradigm, which would have been introduced by a simple “οἷη” and that this may have been the case with Pyrrha.¹³⁶ This is an attractive hypothesis. In other epic catalogues or lists containing *internal* catalogue-features, a word is usually repeated with the addition of a particle indicating the addition of further items. An interesting example is the description of the Shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18.478–608. The scenes depicted on each band of the shield are introduced by the “ecphrastic”-descriptive formula “ἐν δὲ”, which recapitulates a single “ἐν μὲν” employed only for the central boss of the shield, which is described first. The same is the case with the “τὴν δὲ μετ’ ... ἴδον” formula, which is used in the first *Nekyia* (*Od.* 11.225–332). This stereotypical lemmatization mechanism is based on the expression “πρώτην + acc. of feminine noun + ἴδον”, which introduces the first entry in the Catalogue of Heroines, Tyro.¹³⁷ Given that this technique is similar to the use of the ἡ’ οἷη formula in the CW, West’s suggestion is strengthened still further. It seems that this mechanism of creating an internal taxonomical principle of organization, which would be based on an initial itemizing device, is corollary to the technique of “increment recall” employed in list-learning.¹³⁸ According to this method of memorization, a person first learns a part of a list and rehearses it a number of times, until the list has been firmly memorized. He then proceeds by learning another part, which he rehearses separately and then, when memorized, adds to the first part. The learner can go on in this way, building only upon solid memory-acquired foundations. In this light, the use of an itemizing device based on an initial taxonomical mechanism (such as the “ἡ’ οἷη formula” or the “ἐν μὲν formula”) facilitates “seriation”,¹³⁹ the practice of

¹³⁴ (1989) 26.

¹³⁵ Cohen (1989) 27.

¹³⁶ West (1985) 56; Rutherford (2000) 83.

¹³⁷ See Rutherford (2000) 93–94.

¹³⁸ See Baddeley (1990) 40–42, 156–158. See also Minchin (2001) 89 n. 41, to whom I owe the previous reference.

¹³⁹ On “seriation”, see Mandler & Dean (1969) 207–215. I owe this reference to Minchin (2001) 89 n. 41.

sequential data-processing, since the repetition of such an “oral lemma” would key the singer or the performer of a list on the required note and trigger in his memory the subsequent chunk of relevant material.

With respect to content, the CW focuses on women, although one can discern a tendency to use female stories as the frame within which male stories will be narrated.¹⁴⁰ A typical example of this tendency is the *ehoie* of Alcmene, where the myth of Alcmene is, in fact, an introduction to the story of Heracles.¹⁴¹

The CW treats women stories by adopting an encomiastic stance. Female aretalogies are not spelled out in the most emphatic manner but praise is clearly a high priority. This observation is corroborated by the fact that in the Catalogue of Heroines in *Odyssey* 11, Alcinoos intervenes by shelving the Catalogue of Women poetry and asks Odysseus to talk about male heroic epic.¹⁴² His request reflects the tendency to obliterate female poetry and highlight the importance of male-centered epic traditions. Rutherford’s claim that the Catalogue of Heroines in the *Odyssey* preserves an older phase in the evolution of *ehoie*-poetry is thus reinforced, since it indicates that the tradition of the *Odyssey* promotes encomium only for its own protagonists, Odysseus and Penelope, by highlighting the former’s supremacy concerning his Iliadic and other Cyclic rivals (Agamemnon, Achilles, Ajax), and by downplaying potential female epic rivals for the latter, such as *ehoie*-poetry heroines (Tyro, Alcmene)¹⁴³ or Cyclic-epic antagonists (like Clytaemestra in the *Nostoi*).¹⁴⁴ Alcinoos, who is interested in the Iliadic stories of Odysseus, requests that Odysseus change genre and move from female catalogues to male heroic poetry. In fact, it has been recently argued, he phrases this request by leaving the *ehoie*-part of Odysseus’ account completely unmentioned and by using the word οἶα (11.364), which in this context might allude to *ehoie*-poetry.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ On this tendency as an argument concerning the shaping of the CW and its relation to the *Odyssey*, see below on Genre.

¹⁴¹ Rutherford (2000) 86.

¹⁴² Most (1992) argues that in the first *Nekyia* of the *Odyssey*, there are allusions to the epics of Return (*Odyssey*, *Telegony*), *ehoie*-poetry, Iliadic and Cyclic epic pertaining to the Trojan War (*Iliad*, *Aethiopis*, *Little Iliad*), and to the Hesiodic *Theogony*.

¹⁴³ See *Od.* 2.118–122. The genealogical information embedded in the Catalogue of Heroines allows for connections between the various entries, in the manner of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*. Sammons ([2007] 164–165) argues that even “in transforming genealogy into catalogue proper, the result is a disarticulated and fragmentary vision of history.”

¹⁴⁴ See *Od.* 24.192–202.

¹⁴⁵ Skempis & Ziogas (2009).

Rutherford has highlighted the light tone of a fair number of women stories of the *CW*.¹⁴⁶ In spite of some exceptions,¹⁴⁷ his observation is correct but begs, I think, for an explanation. Fantastic, almost superhuman, deeds (like Iphiclus who “upon the fruiting tops of asphodel he ran and did not break them”), pastoral scenes (fr. 70), and even “comic” stories (the *ehoie* of Mestra)¹⁴⁸ that are equally attested in the *CW* may well be related to the light tone of female episodes mentioned above. More light-tone scenes and a fondness for the grotesque are typical of the poems of the Epic Cycle and, as has been repeatedly shown, the key feature distinguishing the highly selective Iliadic and (to a lesser extent) Odyssean traditions from their Cyclic rivals.¹⁴⁹ Viewed from this vantage point, the light tone of certain women stories featured in the *CW* seems to be a built-in characteristic of this genre.

Other motifs attested in the *CW* are divine punishment (e.g. Zeus vs Salmoneus,¹⁵⁰ Zeus and Hera vs Alcyone and Ceyx),¹⁵¹ divine care and gifts offered to mortals (e.g. Harmonia receives for her marriage to Cadmus a *peplos* from Athena),¹⁵² metamorphosis (e.g. the daughters of Porthaon are turned into Sirens)¹⁵³ and immortality (e.g. Heracles)¹⁵⁴ in the form of apotheosis,¹⁵⁵ emphasis on marriage, birth and envy. In particular the last motif seems to be the most developed in the *CW* and is further divided into the following sub-motifs: (a) a woman has children by a god but is married to a mortal after whom the children are named (Molione gives birth to twin sons, who take their name not from their father Poseidon but from Actor, the mortal husband of Molione);¹⁵⁶ (b) women fall in love with gods (Demodice);¹⁵⁷ (c) a girl is abducted by a god, who brings her to a place where they have sex and where the children are born; sometimes the maiden is named after this place and their offspring become kings there (Europa is brought to Crete by Zeus, where

¹⁴⁶ (2000) 86.

¹⁴⁷ As Rutherford himself admits, fr. 131–132 (Proitides) and fr. (176) about the daughters of Leda are far from being light in tone.

¹⁴⁸ Robertson (1984).

¹⁴⁹ Forsdyke (1956) 110 ff.; Griffin (1977) 39 ff.; Davies (1989) 9.

¹⁵⁰ Fr. 30.1–24.

¹⁵¹ Fr. 10a, 84–98. See Hirschberger (2004) 79–81.

¹⁵² Fr. 217.7–8. See Hirschberger (2004) 80–81.

¹⁵³ Fr. 27.

¹⁵⁴ Fr. 25, 229.

¹⁵⁵ Rutherford (2000) 87–88; Hirschberger (2004) 79.

¹⁵⁶ Fr. 17b, 19. See Hirschberger (2004) 74.

¹⁵⁷ Fr. 22. See Hirschberger (2004) 75.

they mate and have three sons, Sarpedon, Minos, and Rhadamanthys);¹⁵⁸ (d) Nymphs mingle with gods (Melaneus is the son of Apollo who mingled with a Nymph);¹⁵⁹ goddesses or nymphs have sex with mortal men (Selene and Endymion);¹⁶⁰ (e) divine envy that often has a fatal outcome is sometimes presented within an erotic-marriage context (Coronis is killed by Apollo who envied her because she married Ischys);¹⁶¹ (f) other stories which often end in marriage between humans are “a mythological reflex of girls’ initiation rites” (Eurythemiste, Stratonice, Sterope, who are the daughters of Porthaon, accompany the Nymphs and the Muses on Mount Parnassus);¹⁶² (g) in certain cases, an unmarried maiden gets pregnant (Periboia gets pregnant by Hippostratus and her father Hipponous sends her to Oineus who is asked to kill her; but Oineus has a son by her, Tydeus);¹⁶³ (h) the “Potiphar’s wife motif”, in which a married woman falls in love with a younger man who visits her house; when he rejects her, she makes a slanderous attack on him telling her husband that he made her have sex with him; as a result her husband tries to kill him (Peleus and the wife of Acastus).¹⁶⁴

In general, there is little about death, especially of women, in the *CW*.¹⁶⁵ Their biographies “are stripped to their essentials”.¹⁶⁶ Seduction, abduction, concealment do exist but only in embryonic form. Heroines are in the *CW* ἄρισται (best), exactly like heroes in male-centered epic, but their appearance in a “collective epic”¹⁶⁷ stems from the fact that they are the wives and daughters of ἥρωες, and that they form an integral part of the dynastic context of the age of heroes.¹⁶⁸

These motifs show that the *CW* shares certain similarities with the poems of the Epic Cycle, which also favor themes like divine punishment, metamorphosis and immortality. Therefore, with respect to content the *CW* marks itself out from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* not only by giving primary position to female figures but also by highlighting themes which are not emphasized in Homeric epic.

¹⁵⁸ Fr. 141. See Hirschberger (2004) 75.

¹⁵⁹ Fr. 26.25. See Hirschberger (2004) 76.

¹⁶⁰ Fr. 10a.60–62. See Hirschberger (2004) 76.

¹⁶¹ Fr. 59–60. See Hirschberger (2004) 76.

¹⁶² Fr. 26.5–21. See Hirschberger (2004) 77–78.

¹⁶³ Fr. 12. See Hirschberger (2004) 78.

¹⁶⁴ Fr. 208–209. See Hirschberger (2004) 78–79.

¹⁶⁵ Lyons (1997) 20.

¹⁶⁶ Lyons (1997) 20.

¹⁶⁷ See Sistakou (2005) 354. On catalogue-poetry in general, see Trüb (1952) 44–83.

¹⁶⁸ Lyons (1997) 10–13, 20.

With respect to narrative, the *CW* with remarkable rapidity¹⁶⁹ *semper ad feminam festinat*.¹⁷⁰ Digressions are practically absent and the narrative moves smoothly through the intermediate phases of a story until it reaches the target-point. Rapidity is, of course, an almost innate characteristic of catalogues but this should not exclude the possibility that it has not been used effectively.¹⁷¹ The individual narrative parts of the *CW* are not loosely connected just because there is no plot. Unity in this generic context does not spring from the various narrative units giving cohesion to the whole but from the whole that unifies all narrative sections. The geographical range of this genealogical panorama presented in catalogue-form, which spans the Greek world, represents a cohesive preamble to the Trojan War that brought the age of heroes to its end.

Catalogue-organization permeates the entire poem, as it also occurs in narrative sections. In the “Wooing of Helen”, the formula “(ἐ)μνᾶτο + nominative of suitors” (sometimes with patronymic), which constitutes an itemizing-entry mechanism facilitating mnemonic recall of information, links the various items of the list of Helen’s suitors, replacing other linking devices which would be regularly employed in a genealogical catalogue. In other words, even when the genealogical framework is not followed, catalogue-poetry features are still put into use.¹⁷² In the same section, the place of a suitor’s origin is regularly stated,¹⁷³ and suitors often send a representative instead of going to the bride’s home themselves. These features indicate that a special kind of *ehoie*, the wedding-*ehoie*,¹⁷⁴ might have become a sub-category of *ehoie*-poetry and that, by extension, other forms of *ehoi*ai might have existed with their own typology.

Direct speech is extremely limited and what is noteworthy is that women never deliver any direct speech. Catalogue-poetry is understandably lacking in direct speech, but the situation in the Odyssean *Nekyia* seems rather different, since some of the heroines in the Underworld

¹⁶⁹ See fr. 10a, 43a.

¹⁷⁰ This phrase is based on the famous Horatian *semper ad eventum festinat* (*Ars poetica* 148).

¹⁷¹ Rutherford (2000) 85 and note 15.

¹⁷² Rutherford (2000) 85.

¹⁷³ See *Od.* 16.245–251, where place names are given together with the overall number of Penelope’s suitors.

¹⁷⁴ See Cingano (2005) 131, who shows that each hero is introduced in the Catalogue of Suitors in a rather typical way. Thematically, both his genealogy, origin and procedure of wooing are described, and dictionally “each entry is introduced by the expression ἐκ (ἀπό) + place of provenance at the beginning of the line (cf. fr. 197.7, 198.2, 199.4, 200.3, 204.44, 52, 56) + the verb ἐμνᾶτο”.

report their own stories to Odysseus, who in his turn reports them in indirect speech to his Phaeacian audience. In my view, this may strengthen Rutherford's suggestion that the Odyssean *Nekyia* represents an earlier stage of non-genealogical *ehoie*-poetry.¹⁷⁵ In this conception, it may be argued that this pre- and non-genealogical *ehoie*-poetry would have included direct speech.

The proximity of the *CW* to the Epic Cycle, with respect to the light tone observed in a number of women tales, can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the episodic nature of the *CW*, which (like the Cyclic epics, as Aristotle has rightly argued)¹⁷⁶ can supply multiple plots. This time, though, the *CW* represents a third narrative option, which can be better described in terms of a three-fold development: the *CW* has an almost zero-degree plot-line,¹⁷⁷ the Epic Cycle is based on an episodic and linear unraveling of the plot,¹⁷⁸ whereas the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* display sophisticated narrative strategies, which are partly responsible for their acclaimed status.

Performance: Organization and Context

With respect to the organization of the mythological material and the preparation of the performance, we can postulate four different levels: (a) the first level of assembling the material by creating a schema, a "chronotopic map", preserving information about places (geographical distribution of the various stemmata and chronological depth of various pedigrees); (b) the second level, in which the *ehoie*-formula, an elliptical "oral lemma", minimizes the itemizing tone of catalogue-poetry by facilitating internal flexibility, moving to-and-fro between genealogies;

¹⁷⁵ Rutherford (2000) 94.

¹⁷⁶ *Poetics* 1459b.

¹⁷⁷ The lack of both a clear-cut plot line and of temporal sequence is also observed in another catalogic device that is regularly employed in epic poetry, the *priamel*, which Faraone ([2005] 253) treats as "a variant of the catalogue form." Sammons ([2007] 96) rightly observes that "the main difference between a *priamel* and an ordinary catalogue is that the last 'item' is given a privileged status in comparison to the other items, such that the latter can be viewed collectively as a 'foil' to the final, preeminent item." Race (1982) 24–27 associates the *priamel* with the tendency observed in ordinary catalogues to expand the last entry, which becomes the most important, albeit not superior to the others. See also Davies (1992) 9. These remarks are especially relevant to the *CW*, where the last big entry, the "Wooing of Helen" section, is elaborated more fully than the previous entries. It is clear that with this section, the *CW* reaches its *telos*, i.e. both its end and its purpose.

¹⁷⁸ Aristotle *Poetics* 1459b1–7.

(c) the third level consists of the “nesting” of further information in certain entries through the cognitive (re)activation of lower-level, secondary data (non-visual elements, other heroes and their stories). This is the case with place-names that trigger other references with which they have been closely tied within the taxonomy of epic memory; (d) the fourth level includes visual cues originating not from epic memory but from spatial memory.¹⁷⁹ In this last case, recalling of material is facilitated by the combination of visual imagery that stores data synchronously and verbal codes creating mental sequences. Information is thus processed through two paths, as Paivio’s “dual coding” hypothesis suggests.¹⁸⁰

The performance context of the *CW* poses insurmountable difficulties. Some of the female figures featuring in the poem had their own heroine cults,¹⁸¹ but the fact that there is so little about death in this epic makes the scenario of performance of the *CW* in the context of the cult of heroines rather unlikely. If the audience of the *CW* included girls and young women, then it would have been possible to draw an analogy with the performance occasion of other genres.¹⁸² Another approach to the performance context, which can be better mapped, concerns neither the occasion nor the gender of the audience but their possible reaction to the performance of the *CW*. This audience would, in all probability, have been impressed by the Pan-Hellenic span of this poem, the attractive proem, which, through the invocation to the Muses, would have indicated to the listeners that an impressive feat of memory was to be performed, and most of all the rapidity of the actual performance. The bard who would sing this extended catalogue with the flawless and continuous introduction of personal names, place-names, and various family-lines, crossed local geographical boundaries and allowed particular members of the audience to identify their own or their ancestors connection to a given pedigree stretching back in time. The present of the performance would thus be linked to the distant past of the heroic predecessors and this would, no doubt, generate enormous excitement among individual listeners. In such a performance context all elements,

¹⁷⁹ See Minchin (2001) 84–87.

¹⁸⁰ See Paivio (1986). I owe this information to Minchin (2001) 27–28.

¹⁸¹ Chloris in Argos; Alcmene in various places. See Rutherford (2000) 88.

¹⁸² See Rutherford (2000) 88, who argues that the Leucippides formed “the subject of the myth-section of Alcman’s best preserved Partheneion (*PMG* 1).” Irwin’s attempt to place the *CW* within a sympotic context seems to me to be off the mark. See the review by Fletcher (2006) 2.

entries, and family-lines count equally.¹⁸³ The astounding sequences of names, which would have been highlighted by the repetition of syntactical devices and recurrent grammatical forms, would have made the whole process very demanding for the singer, who did not want his audience to get bored. The extremely thin and narrow, almost non-existent, plot line was a serious drawback when performing a list-song. On the other hand, the genealogical framework, the catalogue-form, and last, but certainly not least, the *ehoie*-structure, created, for all the restrictions inherent in the genre of catalogue-poetry, a multi-wrought mythical tapestry. In fact, its three components would have captivated the attention of various audiences, just as the different colors of a tapestry would have attracted the visual interest of viewers. Seen from this angle, the success of the *CW* would have depended, perhaps more than any non catalogue-poem, on its delivery. Asking for the help of the Muses before delivering a list-song was not mere commonplace: it amounted to a covert acknowledgment of the inherent difficulty of such a task. In this light, Cingano is probably right in suggesting that there was a second invocation of the Muses before the long catalogue of Helen's suitors at the beginning of Book 5.¹⁸⁴ The divine invocation was not only an appeal for information, but also an indirect statement of the difficulty of the task to be undertaken by the singer. This observation fits very well with a performance scenario according to which the invocation to the Muses could become movable and be transferred in some abbreviated or alternative form inside the poem, every time the bard had to answer to a request from a member of an audience¹⁸⁵ to sing a catalogue-poem concerning the women of the past.¹⁸⁶ This was, after all, a way of reminding his listeners that he was going to undertake a difficult job and that they should appreciate his effort till it is brought to an end.

¹⁸³ This reconstruction of a possible performance context is heavily dependent on Minchin (2001) 90–92.

¹⁸⁴ Cingano (2005) 122. For the function of the invocation in Homeric and Hesiodic catalogues, see Minton (1962) 118–212.

¹⁸⁵ See *Od.* 11.370–372, where Alcinous as a member of Odysseus' Phaeacian audience requests a change of subject, from *ehoie* to male-centered epic. As Sammons (2007) 131 rightly observes, "the subject of women is dropped by audience request, and the next section of the *Nekyia* begins."

¹⁸⁶ Individual entries could have been performed independently and expanded versions of individual *ehoiai* may have existed, even if the *Great Ehoiai* (*GE*) are not an expanded version of the *CW* but a separate poem belonging to the same tradition (D'Alessio [2005a] 176). An *ehoie* could sometimes function as the introduction to another poem, as is the case with the Hesiodic *Shield*. See Rutherford (2000) 88. On the *GE*, see D'Alessio (2005a) 176–216.

Genre

A significant question concerns the fact that the aretalogical element, which seems to have been a built-in feature of the genre culminating in the *CW*, did not develop into expanded epic narrative dealing with κλέα γυναικῶν. This generic confinement may have been caused and/or intensified by the following factors:

- a. Female-centered encomiastic narratives were subordinated to male expanded narratives and divine aretalogies, i.e. in traditional epic and hymnic poetry. The widespread diffusion of Homeric poetry, which soon acquired Pan-Hellenic status and undisputed authority on the one hand, and the impressive rise of hymnic poetry on the other, may have exercised considerable pressure on traditional mythical material linked to women, with the result that it was confined to a single, catalogue-oriented genre.
- b. The “Wooing of Helen” in the last part of the *CW* (fr. 196–204) and the emphasis given to an aretalogy for Penelope, with intertextual prompts to both *ehoie*-poetry (*Od.* 2.124–125)¹⁸⁷ and the oral tradition of the Returns later reflected in the Cyclic Epic *Nostoi* (*Od.* 24.192–202), covertly indicate that only certain female figures who were linked to Trojan and Post-Trojan epic were endowed with their own narrative. Certain key-episodes of their mythical lore that could be accommodated into male epic concerning the Trojan War received a privileged treatment, sometimes allowing us to assume that they are based on lost female narratives, perhaps in the form of *ehoiai*.¹⁸⁸
- c. Since most of these heroines could not be incorporated into the Trojan War saga, given that their marriage stories were of local interest, they were completely overshadowed by the Pan-Hellenic pre-eminence of Homeric poetry.

Rutherford, who speaks of a generic “crossing”,¹⁸⁹ argues that when catalogue-like, non-genealogical *ehoie*-poetry was faced with the general

¹⁸⁷ See Sammons (2007) 101, who suggests that Antinous’ list of women may be evoking “a catalogue poem in which women serve merely to articulate a larger genealogical structure. In this view, there would be the implication that Penelope’s unprecedented cleverness is that of a character capable of sustaining the plot of an epic devoted, in Homer’s manner, to a single tale.”

¹⁸⁸ Rutherford (2000) 93.

¹⁸⁹ (2000) 92.

tendency observed in the archaic period to organize the Greek past by means of genealogies, it was first subordinated to a Pan-Hellenic genealogical framework (such as that seen in the *CW*), and then through the process of “automatization” it became a secondary concomitant, a formal rather than a principal feature.¹⁹⁰ According to Rutherford, the Catalogue of Heroines in *Odyssey* 11 “preserves for us an earlier stage in the development of *ehoie*-poetry, that in a sort of intimation of Bakhtinian polyphony, it deploys the generic voice of the catalog genre.”¹⁹¹ This is certainly true, but one should always bear in mind that the Odyssean Catalogue of Heroines is a special case and that, as suggested above in (b), under the pressure of male-centered epic as well as various changes solidifying Pan-Hellenic trends during the archaic period, *ehoie*-poetry may have been appropriated and subordinated by Homeric epic (the Teichoskopia list in *Iliad* 3 echoes the first contest for Helen, the story of Penelope’s suitors in the *Odyssey* mirrors the first contest for her that was also won by Odysseus, the list of Zeus’ erotic consorts in *Iliad* 14 recalls hymnic material referring to the god’s concubines).

In this light, I would like to propose a slight modification to Rutherford’s otherwise convincing sketch of development of the Hesiodic *CW*. This change is based on the problem concerning the dating of the “generic crossing”, which Rutherford places *before* the composition and/or crystallization of the *Odyssey*. If this scenario is adopted, then the non-development of *ehoie*-poetry into κλέα γυναικῶν cannot be explained. Although this is a complicated issue, I would like to suggest that the immediate antecedents of the *CW*, which included a non-genealogical structure and the *ehoie*-formula, must be dated to a period when Homeric epic had acquired a rather standard form. This scenario better explains the fact that although in Homeric epic we find non-genealogical catalogues of women using itemizing devices resembling the *ehoie*-formula (as is the case with the Catalogue of Heroines in *Odyssey* 11), we do not possess any epic poem dealing with female κλέα. In fact, it can be plausibly argued that the “generic crossing”, so aptly described by Rutherford,¹⁹² must have taken place too late for a further expansion into encomiastic epic narrative such as that referring to the κλέα ἀνδρῶν. An *argument e silentio* for this claim is the tendency of the *CW* “to subordinate

¹⁹⁰ Rutherford (2000) 92.

¹⁹¹ Rutherford (2000) 94.

¹⁹² (2000) 91–93.

male stories to female stories, telling the former within the frame of the later.”¹⁹³ In this conception, the “generic crossing” must have taken place only when the Homeric epics had been consolidated and diffused, at a stage when it was not possible for women to acquire epic fame independently.

Conclusion

Hesiodic poetry, which has been regarded, through comparison with its Homeric counterpart, as ‘secondary-level’ poetry, is replete with poetological signs concerning aspects of generic identity, scope and aim of composition, internal differentiation between martial (*Theogony*) and non-martial (*Works and Days*) epic, as well as the creation of a prismatic, sophisticated narrative with multiple temporalities, voices and registers and a distinct and recognisable Hesiodic tone (*Catalogue of Women*).

Hesiodic song lays great emphasis on its own special intra-generic identity. By describing in detail in the proem of the *Theogony* the process of acquiring the authority to sing, it turns the course of poetic initiation into a statement of its own poetic *credo*. Having defined its special nature, the poetry of the *Theogony* aspires to broaden the scope of its subject matter and reach beyond local audiences. The embedding of a hymn to a Pan-Hellenic goddess such as Hecate within the narrative scaffolding of genealogies and catalogues reflects its desire to surpass the limits of Boeotia and become the theogonic song of the Greek world par excellence. Such broadening of its scope is concomitant to aspirations of distinctiveness, uniqueness and, finally, preeminence among other rival theogonies that may have been less innovative. To this end, the Hesiodic tradition of the *Theogony* attempts to break loose from the dull monotony and suffocating embrace of traditional catalogues, lists and genealogies by incorporating comments offered by the narrator alluding to his own persona.

The *WD* are stamped by the bold step of creating an internal narrator (Hesiod) who constantly addresses an internal narratee (Perses). Hesiodic insistence on interposing the race of heroes within the typologically established “catalogue” of races with its considerable “Eastern” or Indo-European prehistory has the result of emphasizing its Pan-Hellenic outlook to the archaic world. Bearing the dictional armature of didactic epic

¹⁹³ Rutherford (2000) 86.

but not necessarily its limited scope, the *WD* enrich and even redetermine its cross-textual relations with other rival traditions, such as Homeric poetry, or with other poems, now lost to us, but belonging to the same tradition of didactic or 'wisdom' poetry (*Melampody*, *Idaeon Dactyls*, *Chironos Hypothekai*, *Astronomy*, *Kaminos* or *Kerameus*). By restricting the mythological features to the non-rivalry oriented part of the poem, i.e. in the non-didactic core, the *WD* focus on matters of poetics. The epic becomes not the *diegesis* of a mythical professional rivalry but the *display of the rivalry in the hic et nunc of the performance*. It is not about what Mopsos and Chalkas did, or about how Homer, a figure of the past, won a prize, or about how a Centaur advised Achilles (*Chironos Hypothekai*), but about how *real people* (in the sense that they are presented as real), Hesiod and his brother Perses, deal with matters pertaining to daily life. Hesiod's poetic victory in Chalkis is not a mythical event but a tangible reality, achieved in the present by a real (or presented as real) person. The localization of the mythical element at the beginning of the epic may have been a practical solution to the problem of fusing mythological material into a non-mythological poem, given that complete deletion of mythological material was unthinkable. The mythical features the *WD* include in their subject-matter are neither hero- nor region- nor tradition-dependent but belong to a sort of "specialized" mythology the *WD* want to color as "practical". "Myth" is used in the *WD* as an extended preamble, explaining the present state of affairs and making the need for such an epic indispensable. Instead of suggesting an alternative, labor-based pattern for an overall evaluation of its subject-matter, this poem exploits traditional work-oriented terminology and imagery (Agriculture) and a well-known reference to the sailing of the Greek fleet from Aulis to Troy as the "Homerically colored", mythical catch-episode (*Nautilia*) in order to re-christen its main theme by imbuing it with metapoetic connotations. In this way, the Hesiodic tradition makes its voice widely heard and by almost encroaching on the *kleos* of its great Homeric rival, ambitiously accentuates its presence and claims its own space in Archaic Greek epic.

The *Catalogue of Women* (CW) represents the rather idiosyncratic combination of an external geographical organization with genealogical material that is fused with non-genealogical lemmata. This conflated form of genealogical material, which is *thematically* organized in cycles but *dictionally* in lemmata introduced by the *ehoie*-formula, results in the disruption of narrative linearity and in creating ruptures in the chronological fabric of the story. The main features of this eccentric

cross-generic poem are the following: parataxis, tripartite structure for some *ehoie*, language that is partly formulaic and partly more specific and expansive, and female stories—basically imbued with an encomiastic tone—that are often used as a frame for male stories. The main motifs include divine punishment, divine care and gifts offered to mortals, metamorphosis, immortality in the form of apotheosis, stress on marriage, birth and envy, and limited reference to death. The narrative is characterized by rapidity, catalogue-type organization permeates even the narrative sections, direct speech is extremely limited, and brief plots of a purely episodic nature comprise the overall composition. The CW has come into being through generic “crossing”: catalogue-like, non-genealogical *ehoie*-poetry is first subordinated to a Pan-Hellenic genealogical framework and then through the process of “automatization” it becomes a secondary concomitant, a formal rather than a principal feature. This “generic crossing” occurred too late for a further expansion into encomiastic epic narrative such as that referring to the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, i.e. only when the Homeric epics had been consolidated and diffused, at a stage when it was not possible for women to acquire epic fame independently.

THE LANGUAGE OF HESIOD AND THE *CORPUS HESIODEUM*

ALBIO CESARE CASSIO

1. Hesiod's language has always been discussed in relation to that of the Homeric poems (and the "Homeric" *Hymns*) not only because of obvious affinities in metre, dialect and vocabulary, but also because at a chronological level of the late 8th-early 7th century BC there is almost no other type of Greek language (literary or non-literary) with which it can be compared; inscriptions in any dialect are very few and short, and ironically enough the language of the Boeotian Mantiklos epigram (*CEG* 326), certainly earlier than 675 BC, is phonologically very different from that of Hesiod (see below, § 3).

The old problem of the chronological priority of Homer over Hesiod or *vice versa* is meaningless if posed in these terms. To all appearances Hesiod was a real person, which may well not be the case for "Homer": it is highly probable that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, although they basically use the same type of metre and language, reflect different values and interests and belong to different milieus (see § 2), which means that their final version may be the work of two different poets (at least). What is really important is that Hesiod adopted a competitive stance towards heroic epic, as Graziosi ([2002] 168–170) and Steiner (2005) have rightly emphasized in recent times. In other words, Hesiod as an individual may have been older than the "monumental" poet of the *Iliad*, but he was certainly younger than the poetic traditions of heroic epic to which the poet of the *Iliad* gave its final shape, and knew very well the language mixture in which that heroic poetry was expressed. In this sense one is justified in saying that Hesiod is more or less "Homeric" in a given passage of a poem: the main point is not the imitation of an author, but the allegiance to a poetic tradition.

Unfortunately, we often do not know to what extent we are before a text originally recited (or sung) by Hesiod himself, or later interpolations, or even whole poems of totally different authorship—a problem already discussed in Hellenistic times. In the wake of a number of modern scholars I regard the *Aspis* as spurious; in antiquity the *Catalogue of Women* (henceforth *CW*) was considered the continuation of the *Theogony*, and it may

well contain Hesiodic material, but its bulk is likely to have been the work of post-Hesiodic poets, composed between the last decades of the seventh c. BC and the first two or three of the sixth (Hirschberger [2004] 42–51). *Theogony* and *Works and Days* (WD) are mostly genuine; yet they are surrounded by much controversy over the authenticity of specific passages; two alternative versions of the same story are frequent but either is often regarded as spurious. In general terms, the Hesiodic *corpus* seems to have circulated in a shape that was much more fluid than its Homeric counterpart (Rossi [1997], Ercolani [2001]). Some of the fakes, like e.g. the Χείρωνος ὑποθήκαι, were very influential in antiquity (Schwartz [1960] 228–244, D'Alessio [2005b] 232).

2. It is interesting that a number of Hesiodic lines occur in almost identical form in the *Odyssey* and nowhere else in the archaic epic we possess (Edwards [1971] 166–189); e.g. *Th.* 27 ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, *Od.* 19.203 ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα; *Th.* 228 Ὑσμίνας τε Μάχας τε Φόνους τ' Ἄνδροκτασίας τε, *Od.* 11.612 ὕσμινας τε μάχαι τε φόνοι τ' ἀνδροκτασῖαι τε; *Op.* 317 αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζει, *Od.* 17.347 αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρεῖναι; some “formulaic” expressions, like e.g. ἀεσίφροσι θυμῷ / ἀεσίφρονα θυμόν, are found only in the *Odyssey* and the *Works and Days* (*Od.* 21.302, *Op.* 315, 335, 646).¹

The similarity between these lines and formulae is probably due to the fact that both Hesiod and the poet(s) of the *Odyssey* were rooted in very similar “continental” traditions of Ionic poetry. I do not want to revive the old theory that “the *Odyssey* ... received its first substantive form in the ancient epic schools of Boeotia” (Thomson [1914] 87) but the importance of mainland sagas and interests in the poem is undeniable and there are also various linguistic indicators of a “continental” origin of the poem. Over the last thirty years it has been realized—also in the wake of the spectacular discoveries in Lefkandi—that Euboea must have played a remarkable role in the development of Ionian epic (Peters [1986], West [1988], Cassio [1998]); Peters [1986] and [1987] regards Homer as a “Westionier” and according to M.L. West ([1988] 172) “the *Odyssey* might well be a Euboean poem”. If the *Odyssey* was the work of

¹ In the *Nekuia* many lines are identical with lines of the *Ehoiai* (e.g. in the story of Tyro: *Od.* 11.249 f. = fr. 31.2 f. M.–W. etc.), but they are often regarded as late interpolations from the *Ehoiai*. However, Hirschberger (2004) 62 regards them as “traditionelles episches Sprachgut”.

Euboean singers the affinities with Hesiod would be easier to explain; in recent times the importance of the latter's "Euboean connections" have rightly been emphasized by Debiasi (2008).

There are also remarkable similarities between the language of the Hesiodic *corpus* and that of some Homeric *Hymns*, especially *Hymn* 2 to Demeter, 3, 179 ff. to Pythian Apollo, 4 to Hermes and 5 to Aphrodite; the first three are likely to be the work of continental poets. I shall not dwell on these similarities in detail since they were magisterially treated by Richardson (1974) and Janko (1982).

When studying the divergences between Hesiod's language and that of Homer we should never forget to take into account the differences in subject-matter and vocabulary. These are especially striking in the *WD*: "where Hesiod is talking about farm-carts and ploughs it is not to be expected that his language is going to conform to Homer's as closely as in a narrative passage" (Edwards [1971] 32); and in fact "by far the greatest number of un-Homeric words occur in the *Works and Days*" (West [1966] 77): see e.g. *Op.* 723 ἐκ κοινοῦ πλείστη τε χάρις δαπάνη τ' ὀλιγίστη where both κοινός and δαπάνη are unattested in Homer. In general terms, Hesiod's vocabulary and style are remarkably close to the Homeric model in the *Theogony*, but far less so in the *WD* where the language of everyday life has a major role. The pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* is peculiar in many ways, especially since it does not share a number of non-Homeric features common to the *Theogony* and the *WD* (Edwards [1971] 195 f.). On the *CW*, see below, § 13.

3. Before moving to a discussion of the linguistic shape of Hesiod's text it will be useful to provide a brief sketch of the dialects (either spoken or used for literary purposes) with which he is likely to have been familiar.

(a) Thessalian, Boeotian and East Aeolic (also called Asiatic Aeolic or Lesbian) belong to the Aeolic dialect group. We do not expect the presence of specifically Thessalian features in Hesiod's language, and in fact there are none. Instead, for a variety of reasons, one would expect some Boeotian and East Aeolic forms. Hesiod was born in Ascrea on the eastern slopes of Mount Helicon (*Op.* 640); he is called Βουιωτὸς ἀνὴρ by Bacchylides (5.191) and in all likelihood Boeotian was the dialect he used in everyday life. Theoretically some influence of spoken Boeotian on Hesiod's poetry would be perfectly possible; moreover, the existence of a Boeotian poetic tradition independent from Homer has sometimes been assumed (Hoekstra [1957], Durante [1971] 142) on the basis of the Mantiklos epigram, carved on a small bronze statue of Apollo found in Thebes

and now in Boston, going back to a date not later than ca. 675 BC, in which Boeotian phonology and morphology are undeniable.² However, the idea that the Mantiklos epigram is testimony to a Boeotian poetic tradition independent from Homer is not universally accepted.³

East Aeolic was the dialect spoken by Hesiod's father (born in Aeolic Kyme in Asia Minor) and for this reason the presence of some forms of this dialect in his son's poetry would not be inconceivable (e.g. Schwyzler [1939] 108, Morpurgo [1964] 139). But East Aeolic also played a key role in the creation and diffusion of prestigious literary languages: Lesbos was an extremely important stage in the development of Homeric epic, and Terpander's success at Sparta in the first half of the 7th century BC presupposes the existence of a long and flourishing lyric tradition in East Aeolic (Cassio [2005]), and so does Sappho's and Alcaeus' poetry. As a consequence some literary influence of this dialect on Hesiod is also very plausible.

(b) North West Greek (NWG) and Doric dialects. From the middle of the 19th century onwards it has often been assumed that both the cultural world of Delphi and the Delphic (NWG) dialect exerted remarkable influence on Hesiod (especially on the *Theogony*); the problem will be dealt with in detail presently. The story of Hesiod's death in Locris (Thuc. 3.96, *Certamen Hom. et Hes.* 14, Pausan. 9.31 ff.) may be an indication of Hesiod's contacts with speakers of NWG dialects.

(c) Attic-Ionic dialects. To the south Boeotia borders Attica, and to the east only a very narrow channel, the Euripus, separates the Boeotian coast from Euboea, where an Ionic dialect was spoken. This close proximity obviously favoured personal contacts between Boeotians and Ionians for the most diverse reasons but linguistically Boeotian and the dialects of the Attic-Ionic group were remarkably different (as revealed *inter alia* by the many jokes we encounter in Old and Middle Comedy: Colvin [1999]). To a speaker of Boeotian it must have been somewhat difficult to communicate with an Ionian, probably more difficult than with a Dorian.

At the literary level, the latest phases of the Homeric epics were profoundly and definitively modified by the Ionic dialects (not exclusively East Ionic, but also Euboean). In M.L. West's words ([1988] 165), "it is

² CEG 326: Μάντικλος μ' ἀνέθηκε φεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξοι/τᾶς {δ}δεκάτας · τὸ δὲ Φοῖβε δίδοι χαρίζετταν ἄμοιβ[άν]. "Manticlus dedicated me to the Far-Darter of the silver bow out of the tithe. Do thou, o Phoebus, render a kind return" (tr. Friedlaender-Hoffleit [1948] 38).

³ E.g. Heubeck (1979) 120: "der hexametrische Zweizeiler ist weitgehend mit homerischem Wort- und Formelmateriale, umgesetzt in boiotische Dialektformen, gestaltet".

clear that the epic poetry which overran Greece from about 750 [BC] was Ionian epic and that it had no serious rival in Lesbian or any other dialect". I have already dwelt on the role that Euboea presumably played in the last phases of the development of Ionic epic, and Euboea is precisely the place where Hesiod won the musical contest on the occasion of the funeral games in honour of King Amphidamas (*Op.* 650 ff.). If the Homeric epics recited in Boeotia already had the linguistic shape we are familiar with, all its numerous Ionic features must have sounded familiar to an Euboean audience but distinctly foreign to a Boeotian one.

4. Let us now cast a look at Hesiod's text against this backdrop. As it is transmitted in papyri and medieval manuscripts it basically shows the same dialect mixture as Homer's. Typically Ionic is the use of [ε:] in the place of inherited [a:] (e.g. *Th.* 770 πρῶτον ἔνῃ τετρας τε καὶ ἑβδόμῃ ἱερὸν ἦμαρ), quantitative metathesis (e.g. *Op.* 451 ἀνδρὸς ἀβούτεω, with -εω prosodically monosyllabic), initial [w] ("digamma")⁴ often neglected (as a matter of fact, more often than in Homer, Edwards [1971] 132–139; see § 10) and the typically Ionic additional -σαν e.g. in *Th.* 29 ἔφασαν, *Op.* 74 ἔθεσαν; even some Ionic forms not attested in Homer are found in Hesiod, e.g. *Op.* 68 Ἑρμείην vs. Homeric Ἑρμείας, -αν, *Th.* 260 δίη (Hom. always δῖα), *Th.* 938 Μαίη, (but Μαῖα fr. 169.3).⁵ Obviously enough, Hesiod also shows the typically Homeric Aeolisms, e.g. athematic infinitives in -μεναι, genitives in -ᾱο and ᾱών, plural datives in -εσσι(ν) of athematic stems etc.

On the other hand numerous linguistic forms found in Hesiod are well attested in various dialects different from Ionic (Edwards [1971] 101–121) but are never found in Homer. At *Th.* 19 and 371 λαμπρᾶν τε σελήνην is best regarded as an Atticism (see below, § 14). Other remarkable non-Homeric features are: *Th.* 30 ἔδον = Ion. ἔδοσαν, *Op.* 139 ἔδιδον = Ion. ἐδίδοσαν, *Th.* 321 and 825 ἦν = Ion. ἦσαν, numerous instances of short accusative plurals of the first declension (*Th.* 60 ἐννέα κούρας ὁμόφρονας; *Th.* 267 Ἀρπυιάς, 401 μεταναιετάς, 534 and 653 βουλᾶς, possibly 804 εἰράς, *Op.* 564, 663 τροπᾶς, 675 δεινᾶς, fr. 150, 15 Σκύθᾶς, but only one certain instance of a short acc. plur. of the second declension, λαγός at *Scut.* 302), *Op.* 698 τέτορα = Ion. τέσσερα, *Th.* 890 (and

⁴ When speaking of oral poetry the word "digamma" should be avoided since it refers to the written sign Ϝ for [w] which was probably never written in any epic text.

⁵ The Hesiodic fragments are numbered according to those of Merkelbach-West (1967). See West (1966) 80.

elsewhere) ἔην ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν,⁶ *Th.* 41 and 129 gen. plur. θεῶν, *Op.* 145 μελιᾶν, fr. 236 Θόᾶν = Θόαντα, fr. 69 Ἀθάμᾶ = Ἀθάμαντος; *Th.* 585, *Op.* 63 κάλόν, *Op.* 752 ἴσον with a short first vowel; *Op.* 683 αἰνῆμι = Ion. αἰνέω; *Op.* 666, 693 καυάξαις (= [kawwaks-] < *katwaks-) = Ion. κατᾶξαις; *Op.* 526 δείκνῦ (< *-ūt) = Ion. δείκνυσι, *Op.* 426 ἄψιν,⁷ *Op.* 22 ἀρώμεναι, *Op.* 696 τριηκόντων (= τριήκοντα inflected in the genitive),⁸ *Op.* 611 ἀποδρέπεν.⁹

Since these features are found mainly either in Doric/NWG dialects (e.g. ἔδον, ἦν, τέτορα, ἀποδρέπεν) or in Aeolic ones (e.g. καυάξαις, δείκνυ, τριηκόντων; θεῶν and μελιᾶν can be either Doric or Aeolic), the ancients conceived of them as borrowings from real dialects (Cassio [1993b]): for instance, ἦν = ἦσαν and the short accusative plurals were universally interpreted in antiquity as Doric forms imported into an epic language of the Homeric type.¹⁰

In modern times the whole problem has often been re-examined and various theories on the Hesiodic “dialect mixture” have been put forward. Not surprisingly, a good deal of attention has been paid to the non-Homeric features (henceforth NHF), since they have been supposed to reveal cultural or linguistic affiliations to the Doric or Aeolic world. The main problem has always been (and, I am afraid, will always be) whether Hesiod borrowed the NHF from spoken dialects or from literary traditions different from the Homeric one.

5. In the first half of the 19th century Karl Götting ([1843] xxix) pointed out a number of remarkable similarities in content and style between the Delphic oracles and Hesiod: on the one hand the oracles¹¹ often show the same type of moral advice offered by Hesiod, especially in the *WD*, on the other they often employ the same “*kenning* style” found in Hesiod (e.g. *Op.* 524 ἀνόστεος “boneless” = “octopus”; 778 ἰδρις, “the one who knows” = “ant”, fr. 204.129 ἄτριχος “hairless” = “snake”).

⁶ With a variant ἐσκάτθετο, see § 9.

⁷ West 1978 prints ἄψιν with a rough breathing, but the word is always psilotic in epic texts and was certainly psilotic if it was borrowed from East Aeolic (Wackernagel [1916] 176, West [1978] 265).

⁸ This form is a hybrid (probably going back to Hesiod himself) since the Aeolic form shows an Ionic vocalism (τριᾶ- > τριη-).

⁹ Not certain, see West [1978] *ad loc.*

¹⁰ Heracl. Miles. fr. 50 Cohn, Aristonic. fr. 269 Friedlaender and Choerob. 1.123.11 Hilgard quote as Doric also the nomin. participle δῆσᾶς at *Th.* 521, a variant reading of obscure origin (Morpurgo Davies [1964] 152 n. 2) not accepted by modern editors.

¹¹ Collected by Parke and Wormell (1956).

In *de Pythiae oraculis* (406 E) Plutarch provides us with many instances of *kenningar* attested in oracles: the Arcadians were called βαλανηφάγοι “acorn eaters”, the Delphians πυρρικάοι, “fire-burners” (because of the many sacrifices they performed), while ὀρεμπόται “drainers of mountains” was used as a *kenning* for rivers etc. Hesiod’s familiarity with the Delphic oracle is evident from the *Theogony* (499 f.), and Götting ([1843] xxxi f.) interpreted the above-mentioned similarities as due to the influence of the Delphic hexameters on Hesiod’s poetry. Since some of the oracular hexameters we possess occasionally show features interpretable as Doric or Aeolic, he attributed the NHF of Hesiod’s language to the influence of Delphic poetry.

Götting’s views are now obsolete, especially since it is often clear that it is the oracles that depend on Hesiod and not the reverse;¹² nevertheless, the idea that Delphi exerted a linguistic influence of some sort on Hesiod was destined to be remarkably successful. The founder of modern Greek dialectology, Heinrich Ludolf Ahrens, expressed his opinions on the Hesiodic language in his treatise *De dialecto Dorica* (Ahrens [1843]) and in slightly modified form in an article published ten years later (Ahrens [1853] 174–177). He never doubted that Hesiod’s poems were basically composed in the same dialect mixture as Homer. In his opinion the Boeotian influence was minimal and the NHF had two main components, one East Aeolic and one Doric/NWG (*Doris septentrionalis* in his terminology). He noticed that the East Aeolic features were virtually confined to the *WD* and linked their presence with the East Aeolic origin of Hesiod’s father. On the other hand he found that most of the Doric/NWG forms were attested in the *Theogony*, and, following Götting’s suggestion, he attributed them to the influence of the Delphic dialect.

On this point, however, there is a remarkable divergence between his views of 1843 and those of ten years later. In 1843 Ahrens maintained that Hesiod’s non-Homeric features matched those of the Delphic prose inscriptions; in other words he assumed that Hesiod’s poetry was influenced by the dialect *spoken* at Delphi. In 1853, however, the picture had significantly changed: Delphi still played a central role, but Ahrens regarded the *Theogony* as influenced by a tradition of hieratic poetry based in Delphi (*eine delphische Dichterschule*), and mentioned such

¹² For instance Hes. *Op.* 283 ἀνδρὸς δ’ εὐόρκου γενεῇ μετόπισθεν ἀμείνων = Herodot. 6.86 γ = Parke-Wormell [1956] no. 35).

mythical poets as Olen, Chrysothemis and Philammon, linked by the ancient tradition to the beginnings of poetry in Delphi (Ahrens [1853] 177). In short, now Doric enters Hesiodic poetry not through a spoken dialect, but through a literary language based on a spoken dialect. Ahrens' views were based on various passages in Pausanias' book 10 containing a romanticized history of the origins of poetry in Delphi; not surprisingly, a Doric colouring is present in some of the lines quoted by Pausanias (10.5.8), like those in praise of Olen attributed to the allegedly archaic poetess Boio (in all likelihood a Hellenistic fabrication):

Ὡλήν θ', ὃς γένετο πρῶτος Φοῖβοιο προφάτας,
πρῶτος δ' ἀρχαίων ἐπέων τεκτάναντ' αἰοιδάν.¹³

6. Ahrens' ideas were basically accepted in Rzach (1876), which is still the most detailed work on the Hesiodic language. Yet, they were destined to be challenged in 1887, when the German Indo-Europeanist August Fick published a "reconstructed" edition of both poems. Fick regarded all the Ionic forms in Hesiod as later manipulations; he tried to translate the *Theogony* into an "archaic Delphic dialect" and the *WD* into "archaic Aeolic", the dialect of Hesiod's father. The basic problem is that metrically guaranteed Ionic forms are simply ineradicable from Hesiod's text; the reconstruction of supposedly "original" texts in "pure" NWG or Aeolic leaves us with a long series of fragments—which is exactly what Fick's "edition" is made up of. Not surprisingly, Fick's attempt "was bound to have a somewhat cold reception" (Morpurgo Davies [1964] 139).

Some of the non-Homeric features were briefly re-examined by Wackernagel (1916) 175–177, who tackled the problem of Hesiod's possible dependence on an Aeolic phase of the epics previous to the Ionic one. To his mind αἶνῆμι and κανάξαις might theoretically be due to an old Aeolic epic still alive in the Greek mainland, yet *Op.* 696 τριηκόντων and *Th.* 826 ὄσσων seemed to Wackernagel to belong to a more recent stage of Aeolic poetry;¹⁴ as a consequence he considered Hesiod's Aeolisms linked with "der kymäischen Abstammung Hesiods oder mit sonstigen unerkennbaren Einflüssen des Asiatisch-Äolischen auf mittellgriechische

¹³ = [Boeo] fr. 2 (Powell [1925] 24). Note Doric προφάτας and τεκτάναντο, but πρῶτος (twice), not πρῶτος.

¹⁴ As a matter of fact "eyes" in the plural is posthomeric (in Homer only the dual ὄσσε is attested) but not exclusively Aeolic (see the passages quoted in West [1966] 385). I am not convinced by West's own conjecture ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε at *Th.* 826 for the transmitted ἐκ δέ οἱ ὄσσων.

Dichtung". It is significant that one of the greatest Indo-Europeanists of all times had to leave this important question open.

7. It was A. Morpurgo Davies' article of 1964 that marked a turning point in the evaluation of Hesiod's "Doric" features. She noted that in spite of the progress made by comparative philology and Greek dialectology in the first half of the 20th century Ahrens' interpretation of the Hesiodic data had never been challenged (Morpurgo Davies [1964] 139), and proceeded to re-examine the NHF regarded by Ahrens as Doric or NWG (she does not discuss the Aeolic features and accepts their interpretation as East Aeolic, the dialect spoken by Hesiod's father).

She pointed out that most of the forms considered Doric/NWG by Ahrens and Rzach are in fact archaisms kept in those dialects but discarded in others at some point; these archaisms must have been used at high chronological levels even in those dialects where only innovations are attested. For instance, ἦν (3rd person plural) "may be either an archaism preserved in the formulaic diction, or an element of his [Hesiod's] everyday language, or one of the Aeolic features of his poetry, or a Doric or North West Greek feature. None of these suggestions can be proved and none of them seems more probable than the other: the only sure conclusion is that ἦν is no evidence for a Locrian-speaking or a Delphic-speaking Hesiod" (Morpurgo Davies [1964] 145). The only feature that seems unequivocally Doric is τέτορα (it would have been πέτταρα in Boeotian, πέσσυρα in Asiatic Aeolic, τέσσερα in Ionic).

Many pages are devoted to the thorny question of the short accusative plurals of the first and second declension, a problem closely linked to that of the preposition ἐς/εἰς. The basic data are as follows: the original form of the preposition was ἐνς¹⁵ and the accusatives of the first and second declension ended respectively in -ᾶνς (<*-āns because of Osthoff's law) and -ονς, e.g. ἄλλονς, θύρᾶνς. These final -νς underwent different developments in prevocalic (PV) and preconsonantal (PC) position: in the former instance the nasal was kept, in the latter it was dropped without compensatory lengthening (Schwyzer [1939] 336); this led to the creation of doublets inside the same dialect, e.g. ἐνς αὔριον vs. ἐς δώματα, θύρανς ἐπέθηκε vs. θύρᾶς μεγάρων, ἄλλονς ὄρνυθι vs. ἄλλος πάντας, and this situation must surely have obtained at the earliest stages of Greek poetry. At this point in PV position (a) some dialects (e.g. Cretan and Argolic)

¹⁵ Ἐνς is an innovation (the inherited form being ἐν), "Konträrbildung zu ἐξ" (Schwyzer-Debrunner [1950] 456), i.e. it is based on ἐν + -ς taken from ἐξ [eks].

kept -ovς, -ᾶvς, whereas (b) in most dialects the nasal was dropped with compensatory lengthening or other developments (ἐvς αὐριον > εἰς αὐριον, θύρανς ἐπέθηκε > θύρᾱς (or -αις) ἐπέθηκε, ἄλλωνς ὄρνυθι > ἄλλους (or -ως, -οις) ὄρνυθι); in PC position the “short” forms (ἐς, -ᾶς, -ος) were created automatically. The chronology of the events described under (b) is uncertain, but for a long time oscillations between PC and PV forms must have been the rule. Later on each dialect chose either the PV or the PC forms, i.e. either θύρᾱς, ἄλλους (e.g. Attic) or θύρᾶς, ἄλλος (e.g. Arcadian, Cyrenaean). There must have been a number of transitional stages in which the situation was confused; some dialects (Cretan and Cyprian) extended -ανς to the third declension and kept it even in front of a consonant, e.g. στατέρανς, θυγατέρανς, *ki.jo.na.u.se* (i.e. κίονανς < κίονανς in Cyprian, Risch [1984]). Prepositions and articles often show special developments, e.g. ἐς, τός in dialects that generalize “long” forms, cf. Ionic ἐς λόγους, Epich. 276, 7 K.-A. καὶ τὸς ἀνθρώπους, Risch [1984] 425 ff.).

As to ἐς/εἰς Homer is conservative only to a certain degree, in the sense that εἰς (< ἐvς) in PV position (the traditional situation) is attested in roughly two thirds of the instances, otherwise we find the innovated PV ἐς (e.g. *Il.* 1.222 δώματ’ ἐς αἰγιόχοιο Διός).¹⁶ The accusative plurals are a different story: in this case the Homeric text reflects the ancient *état de langue* with remarkable fidelity since the PV endings are always long¹⁷ and thus imply earlier -ovς, -ᾶvς + vowel, e.g. *Il.* 4.376 κλειτούς ἐπικούρους (κλειτούς < *κλεφετόvς), *Od.* 20.66 κούρᾱς ἀνέλοντο (κούρᾱς < κόρφανς). On this point the difference between Homer and Hesiod is remarkable, since the latter shows a number of PV -ᾶς (e.g. *Th.* 60 κοῦρᾶς ὁμόφρονας). As I said in § 4, the ancients regarded these PV -ᾶς as Doric forms. But is this theory acceptable in view of what we now know about the ancient Greek dialects?

8. After discarding some misguided attempts at explaining the PV -ᾶς in Hesiod,¹⁸ Morpurgo Davies [1964] 161 ff. offers her own explanation: since for a long time “the aoidoi in the continent used formulae in which the preconsonantal short accusatives in -ος -ᾶς alternated with

¹⁶ But in some cases ἐς might be only a half-innovation, since it may have replaced an older ἐv; e.g. at *Il.* 4.635 Ἥλιδ’ ἐς εὐρύχορον might have been substituted for an older *ἥλιδ’ ἐv εὐρύχορον.

¹⁷ Apart from a recent variant προφανεῖσᾶς at *Il.* 8.378, discussed by Morpurgo Davies (1964) 156 and n. 3.

¹⁸ Mahlow (1926) 244 ff., 478 ff., von Blumenthal (1942) 103 f.

the prevocalic accusatives in -ονς -ᾶνς” it is conceivable that “when a formula which included a short accusative in a PC position was split up, the same form came to be used in a different position” (Morpurgo Davies [1964] 161 f.). This device was obviously convenient and soon its use was extended: it allowed the creation of e.g. *Op.* 564 μετὰ τροπᾶς ἡελίοιο, whereas traditionally only τροπαὶ ἡελίοιο in the nominative would have been possible (*Od.* 15.404 ὄθι τροπαὶ ἡελίοιο). This means that there is nothing specifically Doric about the “short” accusatives: they are simply an artificial poetic device which proved successful in the Greek mainland. If Morpurgo Davies’ conclusions are accepted, almost nothing is left of the Doric/NWG component of the Hesiodic poetry assumed by Ahrens, Rzach and Fick.

The NHF and numerous other linguistic problems have subsequently been examined in West (1966) 77–91 and in three important books, Troxler (1964), Edwards (1971), and Janko (1982). Particularly in relation to the PV -ᾶς the embarrassment of the experts is palpable. For instance, Edwards assumes that Hesiod pronounced -ᾶς and -ὄς in his own poetic recitation, which to his mind does not necessarily mean that Hesiod spoke a dialect in which the -ᾶς accusatives were current; however, he adds in a note “this would perhaps be the simplest explanation” (Edwards [1971] 165 and n. 54); Janko ([1982] 58–62) also thinks that Hesiod regarded the -ᾶς accusative plurals as short.

A peculiar stance has been adopted by Pavese in various books and articles:¹⁹ his theories are conveniently summarized in Pavese (1998) (where Morpurgo Davies [1964] is not mentioned). His main contention is that Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns* belong to a tradition “independent from the Homeric poems and also from the Homeric and Ionian tradition”, which he calls the “continental poetic tradition”. In his opinion some of the NHF (the short accusatives, κἄλόν and ἴσον with short first vowel, ἐν + acc. in ἐὴν ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν) are “not attributable to the spoken dialect of each individual poet” but precisely to the “continental poetic tradition” (Pavese [1998] 74); what Pavese calls “the Ionic coloring” of Hesiod’s text is supposed to be due to a written collection “made in Attica at the end of the sixth century” ([1998] 81).

9. After this brief survey of some of the most interesting modern opinions on Hesiod’s language I shall try to offer the reader what seems to

¹⁹ Quoted in Pavese (1998) 90.

me the most probable—or least improbable—general picture of Hesiod's language. The first question to be asked is whether we can be certain that the Hesiodic text we possess is a linguistically faithful reproduction of what he recited, or rather it was secondarily manipulated and given an Ionic colouring e.g. in the 6th c. BC. To make the latter hypothesis acceptable it would be necessary to prove that Hesiod's text was originally composed either in specific dialects different from Ionic (e.g. Doric for the *Theogony* and Aeolic for the *WD*, as Fick thought) or in a mainland poetic tradition different from Homer's (e.g. Pavese's theory). What is fatal to both Fick and Pavese is the overwhelming presence in Hesiod's text of Homeric Ionic features that cannot be "translated" into any different form of the Greek language and consequently must have been used by Hesiod during oral composition. Although we cannot exclude the existence of poetic traditions different from the Homeric one and still alive in Hesiod's times, the linguistic evidence offered by Pavese for the existence of a mainland tradition of epic poetry is insubstantial, as the following examples will show.

Pavese (1998) 74 regards the Hesiodic expression (which he calls "formula") ἐὶν ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν²⁰ as an indication that the mainland tradition used ἐν + acc., which is certainly an archaism²¹ kept in NWG, Boeotian, Thessalian and Arcado-Cyprian; the other dialects developed the innovation PV ἐνς / PC ἐς (see § 7). The main point is, however, that ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν does not prove the existence of an epic tradition in which a poet could say e.g. *ἦλυθεν ἐν Θήβας. If a preverb coalesces with a verb at an early stage, both its form and its syntactical construction may become fossilized at that stage, while the corresponding preposition may evolve along different lines. In other words, it was perfectly possible for a poet to say ἐὶν ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν but ἦλυθεν ἐς Θήβας in the following line. As a matter of fact, remnants of the old construction ἐν + acc. are particularly frequent in preverbs (Schwyzer-Debrunner [1950] 456); Eur. *Cycl.* 91 f. ἄξενόν τε γῆν τήνδ' ἐμβεβῶτες does not prove that ἐν + acc. was used in classical Attic in the place of εἰς + acc. (see Troxler [1964] 114 f.). It is interesting that the new ἐνς / ἐς became strong enough to be able to modify the old preverb: hence the frequent variant ἐὶν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν (accepted e.g. by West [1966] and Solmsen [1990]).

²⁰ A variant of ἐὶν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν at *Th.* 487, 890, 899; it is the only form transmitted at fr. 343.7 = *Th.* 890 and is probably to be preferred everywhere.

²¹ Latin *in* [< *en*] *urbem* and Schwyzler-Debrunner (1950) 455 for other Indo-European languages.

Moreover, εἷς < ἐνς is metrically necessary and inescapable in very many lines; for instance *Th.* 292 Τύρινθ' εἷς ἱερὴν (**ἐν ἱεράν or **ἐν ἱερὴν would be unmetrical), *Op.* 291 ἐπὶ δ' εἷς ἄκρον ἴκηται, (again, **ἐπὶ δ' ἐν ἄκρον ἴκηται would not scan). Particularly significant are *Th.* 740 οὐδέ κε πάντα τελεσφόρον εἷς ἐνιαυτόν, 795 τετελεσμένον εἷς ἐνιαυτόν, 799 τελέσει μέγαν εἷς ἐνιαυτόν. Not only is εἷς metrically necessary in all three cases, but *Th.* 740 τελεσφόρον εἷς ἐνιαυτόν occurs many times in Homer (as it happens, especially in the *Odyssey*, e.g. 4.86, 10.467 etc.). It is evident that Hesiod made no bones about using a metrically guaranteed “imported” εἷς, and what is more, in expressions that are identical with those found in Homer.

The theory that κἄλῳς and ἴσως with a short first vowel (*Th.* 585 and *Op.* 63 κἄλῳν, *Op.* 752 ἴσων) are due to a poetic tradition different from the Homeric one is also highly improbable. These forms are chronologically more recent than κἄλῳς and ἴσῳς, with a long first vowel, because they are based on a more recent syllabification of the original groups *-lw-* and *-sw-*; the relationship between κἄλῳς and κἄλῳς is the same obtaining between the old prosody of πατ.ρί (metrically -v-) attested in Homer and the later πατ.ρί (vv-) used in Attic comedy, Epicharmus etc. (Lejeune [1972] § 159; Cassio [1998] 17 ff.). This means that the alleged continental tradition featuring κἄλῳς must have been remarkably more recent than the Homeric one. It is much more natural to suppose that the innovation κἄλῳς, “widespread in post-Homeric epic verse” (Janko [1982] 154) is due to the influence of various spoken dialects where the innovation had taken place (including Boeotian, contrary to what Pavese maintains).²² And there is more. Let us admit *per absurdum* that κἄλῳς and ἴσως belonged to a continental poetic tradition. In the *Theogony* and the *WD* ἴσως is attested once, ἴσῳς eight times; κἄλῳς twice, κἄλῳς twelve times. It seems obvious that Hesiod had very little use for the alleged continental tradition, and by far preferred the Homeric prosody.

Finally, in Pavese's opinion “the short (or light) accusatives -ᾶς -ος” too, are typical of the continental tradition. In my opinion they are likely to be linked with a poetic tradition (see § 16), but probably not a very old one: we ought to remember that PV -ᾶς and -ος are *innovations*, and

²² Pavese (1995) 10 “perdita del digamma postconsonantico senza allungamento compensatorio, come in κἄλῳν ... dialetti attico, euboico, tessalico, lesbico ma non beotico”; but see Thumb-Scherer (1959) 30 (in their discussion of the Boeotian dialect) “f inter Liquidum und Nasalen ohne Ersatzdehnung verschwunden, vgl. z. B. κῶρα”.

the more traditional we suppose a poetic language to have been, the more cautious we should be of positing innovations among its characteristics.

It is evident that the features interpreted by Pavese as proof of the existence of a continental tradition should be interpreted in a radically different manner; they represent a minority in comparison with their Homeric counterparts, and for metrical reasons it is impossible to assume that they were originally in the place of the Homeric ones: *Th.* 7 f. χοροὺς ἐνεποιήσαντο/κᾶλοὺς ἡμερόεντας with Pavese's "continental" χορός and κᾶλός would not scan, and to obtain two "continental" lines in Pavese's sense one would be obliged to rewrite the text completely.

10. The sheer truth is that Hesiod's text was recited in a linguistic shape extremely similar to the one we have. Edwards [1971] 102 has acutely observed that λαμπράν τε σελήνην transmitted twice without variants (*Th.* 19, 371) proves that Hesiod's text is basically genuine, otherwise λαμπράν would have been Ionicized into λαμπρήν (see elsewhere in Hesiod e.g. ἑτέρην, προτέρην, Πανδώραν, λιπαρήν, πέτρην, γλυκερήν etc.).

What some scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries found very hard to accept is that Hesiod the Boeotian composed in a basically Homeric dialect mixture in which the Ionic element was more prominent than in Homer. Yet this is certainly the case. One of the most important indications comes from the neglect of initial prevocalic [w], which occurs more often than in Homer, and frequently in connection with specifically Hesiodic expressions not paralleled in Homer (e.g. *Th.* 275 ἵν' Ἑσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι, *Op.* 63 κᾶλὸν εἶδος ἐπήρατον, Edwards [1971] 134). Pavese (1998) 78 says that [w] was "a more or less vanishing semivowel in all regions" but in fact in many areas of mainland Greece (Phokis, Thessaly, Boeotia) initial [w] is attested in inscriptions well into the Hellenistic age, and if we assume the existence of mainland traditions of poetry we must assume that [w] was pronounced and metrically counted as a consonant (e.g. we expect ἵνα φεσπερίδες, not ἵν' ἑσπερίδες). As Janko (1982) 13 rightly says, "it is impossible to accept that mainland poets would admit the neglect of initial PV digamma without influence from Ionia or at least Attica". Obviously, it is far from certain that in Hesiod's times the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had precisely the shape we are familiar with, but it is certain that a heroic poetry of the Homeric type was already available and was widely circulated (see § 1).

I append two authoritative opinions on this point. According to Hoekstra (1957) 202 Hesiod's language represents "une phase plus avancée que

celle d'Homère et dans laquelle l'élément ionien joue un rôle plus accusé"; and Edwards (1971) 139 says "all the features which we have been examining thus lead to the somewhat paradoxical conclusion that the language of the mainlander Hesiod shows a more decided preference for Ionic forms of expression than does that of the Ionian Homer". That Hesiod's language represents a more advanced linguistic stage is also proven by a number of contractions unknown to Homer (Edwards [1971] 139): *Op.* 753 λουτρῶ (Hom. always λοετρ-), *Op.* 248, 263 βασιλῆς (Hom. βασιλῆς) *Th.* 84 ῥεῖ (Hom. ῥέει), *Th.* 342 Σιμοῦντα (Hom. Σιμόεντ-).

That Hesiod had an Ionic audience in mind when composing is proven beyond doubt by a line in which the coldest month of the year is called *Ληναιών*: *Op.* 504 Μῆνα δὲ Ληναιῶνα, κάκ' ἤματα, βουδόρα πάντα.

The month *Ληναιών* is attested by literary and epigraphical sources for many Ionian towns, including Chalkis in Euboea (*IG* XII 9, 207.26 ff.) where Hesiod sang at the funeral games in honour of the prince Amphidamas (*Op.* 654 ff.), but is unknown to Attica; in Boeotia the local name for *Ληναιών* was *Βουκάτιον* "the month in which oxen are killed".²³ Hesiod deliberately chose the Ionic, and specifically Euboean, name *Ληναιών* because he had an Ionic audience in mind. Two things are remarkable: (1) *Βουκάτιον* (– υ υ ε) would fit the hexameter perfectly, (2) *Βουκάτιον* itself is avoided but the Boeotian name of the month is subtly alluded to with *βουδόρα* "flaying of oxen" (on this point I agree with Janko [1982] 271 n. 118). In general terms, the advocates of a Hesiod originally composing in Doric or Aeolic, or a continental type of epic, should ask themselves what kind of success Hesiod was likely to have in Euboea if he chose to recite in a dialect mixture different from the one hallowed by Homeric poetry.

11. Since Hesiod was born in Boeotia and was active there as a poet, it was only natural to look for typically Boeotian features in his poetry. But very little indeed was found: the only certain instance is the local name of the Sphinx (*Th.* 326 Φῖξ' ὀλοήν). Among modern scholars Troxler (1964) was the most inclined to interpret some of Hesiod's dialect features as Boeotisms, but he was well aware that Hesiod allowed them because they were Homeric, too (Troxler [1964] 239). Thumb-Scherer (1959) 9 thought that *Scut.* 234 ἐπικυρτώοντε was "ein vereinzelter Boiotismus", paralleled by such Boeotian inscriptional forms as δαμιώντες; yet Russo

²³ Where -κα- is the Greek outcome of *-kη- (< *-tkη, zero grade of *tken "to strike", "to kill", cf. *ἐκάνον* (*LIV* s. v. *tken).

(1950) 137 remarked that ἐπικυρτώνοντε was shaped exactly like Homeric ὑπνώνοντας (*Il.* 24.344 etc.); therefore “it seems very questionable ... whether this form can be used as evidence for Boeotian dialect in the *Shield*” (Edwards [1971] 118).

It is true, however, that ἐπικυρτώνοντε *can* also be a Boeotian form; and interestingly enough the percentage of those Homeric morphemes that were also in use in the Boeotian dialect is much higher in Hesiod than in Homer: e.g. the thematic infinitives in -έμεν (φερέμεν, ἐχέμεν etc., Troxler [1964] 101 f.) and the -οις datives (Troxler [1964] 62–68, e.g. *Op.* 234 μαλλοῖς καταβεβρίθασι).²⁴ On the other hand, in archaic hexameter poetry the -οις endings “tend to occur in innovative contexts” as a rule (Janko [1982] 56): by using -οις Hesiod was at the same time Homeric, Boeotian, and innovative.

It is also possible to find now and then a “Boeotianism in disguise”, so to speak. The adjective θεόσδοτος (*Op.* 320 θεόσδοτα πολλὸν ἀμείνω), attested twice in Pindar (*Pyth.* 5.13 and fr. 42.6 S.–M.), is otherwise unknown to the epic tradition and linguistically irregular: the correct form of the nominal compound should be θεόδωτος, which is, however, metrically unsuitable for hexameter poetry.²⁵ It has long been understood (West [1978] 238) that θεόσδοτος must be based on διόσδοτος “given by Zeus”²⁶ and at first glance one might be tempted to regard θεόσδοτος as an artificial formation, a sort of metrical adaptation of θεόδωτος based on διόσδοτος, but one would be wrong. Θεόσδοτος is very often attested as a personal name (spelt Θεόζωτος or Θιόζωτος)²⁷ in Boeotia (and in Thessaly); the name is virtually unknown in other areas of the Greek world.²⁸ The adjective θεόσδοτος is not artificial, but based on a personal name that was at the same time very common in Boeotia and devoid of any specifically Boeotian phonological trait; this is why it was also used by Pindar, a Boeotian by birth. It is interesting that after Hesiod θεόσδοτος seems to disappear almost completely from epic poetry.²⁹

²⁴ Obviously only the PC -οις are significant (PV instances may be elided -οισι endings).

²⁵ It is first attested as an adjective in Pindar, *Isth.* 5.23 and is very common as a personal name all over the Greek world.

²⁶ Which is in turn not a compound proper but the juxtaposition of the genitive Διός (see Schwyzler-Debrunner [1950] 119 on “Pertinentiv”) and the verbal adjective δωτός.

²⁷ See Fraser-Matthews (2000). Obviously <ζ> renders [zd] < [sd], as very often in inscriptions, see Lejeune (1972) § 102 ff.

²⁸ The Θεόζωτοι attested epigraphically at Athens are Boeotians (Threatte [1980] 550).

²⁹ It appears in an oracle quoted by Euseb. *praep. ev.* 4.9 and becomes fairly common in Byzantine prose.

12. The fact that the percentage of e.g. -έμεν and -οις in Hesiod is higher than in Homer does not mean that Hesiod systematically extended the use of the Homeric features that corresponded to Boeotian ones. The case of the masculine -ᾱο genitives of the first declension is revealing. They are already attested in Mycenaean (*su-qo-ta-o* = συβώτᾱο); they appear uncontracted in Homer (Τειρεσίᾱο), but in most dialects -ᾱο was contracted to -ᾱ (e.g. Doric πολιτᾱ < πολιτᾱο); the only dialects where they appear uncontracted are Boeotian (e.g. Λυσιᾱο gen. of Λυσιᾱς) and Arcado-Cyprian (where -ᾱο evolved into -ᾱυ).

In Homer the use of the -ᾱο genitives is far from being generalized, but it is restricted to two main categories: (a) personal names and patronymics (e.g. Τειρεσίᾱο, Βορέᾱο, Οἰδιπόδᾱο, Νηλεΐδᾱο), and (b) epithets of personal names; they are mainly compounds, and *all* of them are *nomina agentis* in -της (< -τᾱς): ἄργεστᾱο, νεφεληγερέτᾱο, ἀκαλαρρεΐτᾱο, βαθυρρεΐτᾱο).³⁰ Clearly in epic poetry the -ᾱο genitives were fundamentally linked from time immemorial with personal names of heroes or personified natural phenomena and epithets describing their activity. In Ionic they became -εω genitives at a very early stage.³¹

Since the -ᾱο genitives belonged to Hesiod's spoken dialect and were well attested in Homer (where they are interpreted as Boeotisms by the scholia),³² one would expect Hesiod to show a higher proportion of -ᾱο genitives than Homer. However, the contrary seems to be the case. In the whole of the *corpus Hesiodeum* (with only one exception I shall discuss presently) all the -ᾱο genitives belong to the categories found in Homer; and in what is commonly regarded as the authentic Hesiod (*Th.* and *WD*) they not only conform to the Homeric categories, but all of them are paralleled in the Homeric text: Ἀΐδᾱο, Οἰδιπόδᾱο, Ὑπεριονίδᾱο, βαθυρρεΐτᾱο, νεφεληγερέτᾱο. There is not a single -ᾱο genitive in the *Theogony* and the *WD* that is not exactly paralleled in Homer. Paradoxically enough, the Hesiodic innovations versus the Homeric categories are few, but all of them are in Ionic: *Th.* 832 ταύρου ἐριβρύχεω, *Op.* 451 ἀνδρὸς ἀβούτεω.

³⁰ There is only one instance in Homer of a genitive in -ᾱο of a noun in -της that is not an epithet: *Il.* 21.75 ἀντί τοί εἰμ' ἱκέταο διοτρεφεῖς αἰδοίοιο.

³¹ In the *Iliad* the Ionic forms are still used for the aforementioned categories (Πελεΐδεω Ἀτρεΐδεω ἀγκυλομήτεω) but in the *Odyssey* some timid attempts at innovations are attested, e.g. 12.412 πλήξε κυβερνήτεω κεφαλὴν, 14.459 and 15.304 συβώτεω πειρητίζων. Obviously the pressure of the spoken Ionic dialect favoured the gradual disregard of the old categories.

³² E. g. *sch. A ad Il.* 11.306 Βοιωτιακὴ γενικὴ ἢ ἄργεστᾱο etc.

For those who think (as I do myself) that Hesiod followed a “Homeric tradition” but was not necessarily dependent on our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* this is rather disturbing: it looks as if he did a mental check of the instances of the -ᾱο genitives in the two poems and decided to use exclusively those which actually occurred there.

As I said, there seems to be only one exception in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* 134. The poet is describing Heracles’ arrows, fitted at the back with the feathers of a dark eagle called φλεγύας:

μόρφονοιο **φλεγύας** καλυπτόμενοι περὺγεσσι.

Edwards (1971) 125 remarks: “φλεγύας Sc. 134 is a word which does not occur in Homer or anywhere else in Greek literature. This, then, is the only -ᾱο genitive in the Hesiodic poems for which we cannot adduce evidence from the possible influence of traditional poetry”.

To my mind, however, this “exception” should be reconsidered in the light of something that seems to have passed unnoticed. Many personal names in Greece were based on names of wild animals, quite often birds (Kyknos): φλεγύας is a common name for a special type of eagle, but is also a personal name, in fact a mythical name of remarkable importance in Thessaly and Northern Greece: he is the father of the nymph Coronis of Pindar’s *Pythian* 3, and so the grandfather of the god Asclepius; he was mentioned in the *CW* (fr. 60) in the genitive and, as it happens, fills the same metrical slot:

ὅτι Ἰσχυς γῆμε Κόρωνιν
Εἰλατίδης, **Φλεγύας** διογνήτοιο θύγατρα.

I have little doubt that the poet of the *Shield* allowed himself to use the common name φλεγύας with an -ᾱο genitive because it was also a personal name and according to the rules of epic it was “lawful” to use those genitives for personal names; the exception is only a half exception.

The poet of the *CW* observes Homer’s basic rule (-ᾱο genitives only in personal names and epithets in -της), but the actual names are often different, e.g. 180.6 Βροτέᾱο, 199.8 Οἰβαλίδᾱο (both absent from Homer).

13. The language of the *CW* and the other works attributed to Hesiod in antiquity has been studied less accurately than the language of the *Theogony* and the *WD*. West (1985) 167–171 pleads for an Attic origin of the *CW* but from a strictly linguistic point of view the presence of isolated Attic forms (e.g. 204, 91 οὔσαν)³³ does not prove very much (see now

³³ The explanation of γλωθρῶν (fr. 204.124 instead of the correct βλωθρῶν) as due to an Attic poet (West [1985] 170f.) is very doubtful, see Janko (1982) 225.

Debiasi [2008] 21). The CW reflects the interests of areas of Northern Greece where Aeolic and/or Doric dialects were spoken (Fowler [1998]), and the poet who composed it (granted that it was *one* poet) is likely to have been the speaker of a Doric or an Aeolic dialect. Some NHF put in an appearance here and there: for instance, the pronoun ἴν, found at fr. 245.1 ἴν δ' αὐτῷ θανάτου ταμίης points to a Doric dialect (φίν);³⁴ the poet might well have used the Homeric form οἷ (*Od.* 21.304 οἷ δ' αὐτῷ πρῶτω κακὸν εὔρετο) but chose ἴν. The poet of the CW preferred ἥδυμος (fr. 330) to Homeric νήδυμος, precisely as the author of the “Homeric” *Hymn to Hermes* did (241 προκαλεύμενος ἥδυμον ὕπνον), since he was familiar with (φ)άδυμος, commonly used in Doric and Aeolic milieus³⁵ (“a relic of lost mainland hexameter poetry ... or simply taken from spoken dialect”, Janko [1982] 138). The creation of Homeric νήδυμος was due to Ionic singers to whom ἥδυμος was an obsolete and purely literary adjective; they resyllabified e.g. ἔχεν ἥδυμος as ἔχε νήδυμος, according to the preferred syllabic structure CV ([e.k^he.ne:-]); see Leumann (1950) 44 f.

In some personal names we find a declension -ᾱς, gen. -ᾱ, acc. -ᾱν instead of -ᾱς, -ᾱντος, -ᾱντα: e.g. gen. Ἀθάμᾱ (fr. 69, for the expected Ἀθάμᾱντος), acc. Θόᾱν (fr. 236, instead of Θόᾱντα); at *Op.* 383 the compound Ἀτλαγενέων is based on Ἀτλᾱ-, not Ἀτλᾱντ-. Since this type of declension is well attested in Doric and Aeolic areas (West [1978] 255, Janko [1982] 224) it is often attributed to either of these dialects (Ἀθάμα is dubbed “dorisches” by Hirschberger [2004] 255); yet in many instances the -nt- declension may be an innovation (Schwyzer [1939] 526) which would favour an inclusion of Ἀτλαγενέων, Θόᾱν etc. in the category of those non-Ionic dialect features that are also archaisms and as a consequence provide no indication of the linguistic or cultural allegiances of the author(s).

On the whole, however, the language of the CW sounds Ionic and innovative. There is a remarkable increase in the use of the “iterative-intensives” in -σκον, which are peculiar to Ionic (Zerdin [2002] 109); we find numerous forms unknown to Homer (and the authentic Hesiod) like e.g. fr. 62.2 δρομάασκε, 62.3 σινέσκετο, 67 (b) τίθεσκε, 204.125 ῥέεσκε, 204.128 τρύχεσκε. There are various untraditional shortenings and lengthenings of vowels: at fr. 185.2 Παρνεθίησιν, if it is genuine and

³⁴ West (1985) 167; φίν is attested at Gortyn (Crete), see Thumb-Kieckers (1932) 163.

³⁵ *Epich.* fr. 175 K.-A. λόγων ... ἄδύμων; Ἀδυμος is well attested as a personal name in Thessaly (Fraser-Matthews [2000] s.v.)

refers to mount Parnes (Πάρωνης gen. Πάρωνηθος)³⁶ shows an unexpected shortening of the second syllable (one would expect *Πάρωνηθίησιν which, however, would not scan); at fr. 67 (b) αἰδέλα (“invisible”) looks like a rather daring manipulation of Homeric αἰδηλος, with lengthening of the second syllable and shortening of the third.³⁷ The verb ἄμύω with a short [a] (204.124 ἄμύοντα χαμᾶζε) is surprising since it seems to be the same verb as Homeric ἡμύω;³⁸ it looks as if the poet of the CW completely ignored the Homeric present and extracted an ἄμύω from imperfects or aorists (ἡμυον, ἡμυσσά) on the model of e.g. ἄμύνω / ἡμυνα. According to West (1985) 135 the formulaic style of the CW shows “an advanced stage of decadence”, which is certainly right; although the diction of the CW follows the Hesiodic model, it shows various signs of disintegration that make Hesiod’s authorship very unlikely. Again, there is nothing clearly and exclusively traceable to the Boeotian dialect.

14. It seems certain to me that Hesiod and the poets who composed in his wake decided to a large extent to be more Ionic than Homer. Yet, the NHF remind us that Hesiod and his followers were far from being completely “enslaved” to epic diction of the Homeric type. So how are we to judge these features? Where do they come from?

As to those that look more Ionic than their Homeric counterparts, some may really be due to the willingness to emphasize the “Ionicness” of the text, like e.g. Ἐρμείης, probably created by providing the Homeric Ἐρμεί-ᾱς with the -ης of the contracted Ἐρμῆς, employed by Homer and Hesiod himself. Δίη is the legitimate (but untraditional) Ionic feminine of the adjective δῖος (Homeric δῖα is originally a noun, see Mycenaean *di-wi-ja*); it is interesting that it is constantly followed by τε (*Th.* 260 δῖη τε Μενίππη, see also fr. 169.2 and 70.10), which means that it was certainly created for metrical reasons as the feminine pendant of δῖός τε (e.g. *Hom. Il.* 13.195 δῖός τε Μενεσθεύς) since **δῖα τε Μενίππη would have been unmetrical. The same is likely to be true for Μαῖα at *Th.* 938, hence Μαίη τέκε κύδιμον Ἐρμῆν. These forms make the Hesiodic text look more Ionic than Homer’s, but technically they should not be called hyperionic: it should be recalled that e.g. ἀτελείη for ἀτέλειᾱ is well attested in Ionic literature and inscriptions (Thumb-Scherer [1959] § 312.1a).

³⁶ I.e. if it is not to be corrected into παρθενίησιν.

³⁷ <ει> in αἰδέλα is likely to be the well known graphic convention for [i:], very common from the 1st century BC onwards.

³⁸ Which has no plausible etymology.

That Hesiod recited λαμπράν τε σελήνην is certain since it is transmitted twice in this Attic form (*Th.* 19 and 371) and in other archaic hexameters where one would expect λαμπρήν (see West [1966] 81). We know very little about cults of Selene in Greece, but her daughter Πανδία (*Hom. Hymn.* 32.15) certainly played a role in Athenian genealogy, since she was the wife of Antiochos, the ancestor of the Antiochid tribe (Apolod. *FGrHist* 244 F 162), and the *Homeric Hymn* 32 εἰς Σελήνην is probably meant for an Attic audience (West [2003] 19). So the likeliest solution is that Hesiod's λαμπράν τε σελήνην was taken from Attic hexameter poetry:³⁹ hymns in epic language tinged with Attic must have been fairly common in archaic and classical Athens (Burkert [1994] 48, Cassio [2000] 100–105). It is extremely likely that Hesiod had learnt that half-line “in that form and not in the form λαμπρήν τε σελήνην or λαμπράν τε σελάναν” (Edwards [1971] 103; see also Troxler [1964] 108 and 238). Note that at *Th.* 371 Θεία δ' Ἡελίον τε μέγαν λαμπράν τε Σελήνην the form Θεία, too, may be Attic (Edwards [1971] 104). Hesiod's familiarity with Attic myths is proven by Πανδιονίς = “swallow” at *Op.* 568 (Debiasi [2008] 23).

15. In this case it is relatively easy to assume a borrowing from an Attic poetic tradition since λαμπράν τε Σελήνην is found in the final part of a hexameter and gives the impression of a formulaic phrase. But this is hardly the case for most of the other NHF. As we have seen, some scholars tend to interpret the NHF as borrowings from Doric, NWG or Aeolic spoken dialects, while others assume the influence of poetic traditions based on those dialects or oscillate between the two interpretations. And by Hesiod's times the alleged alternative traditions may have been something very different from “poetry in pure local dialect”. For instance, most of the Aeolisms appear in the “advice on seafaring” in the *WD* (618–694): while, as we have seen, various scholars see their source in the spoken dialect of Hesiod's father, according to Janko ([1982] 168) “it was knowledge of a body of Aeolic poetry ... which caused Hesiod to employ these forms. Such poetry need not have been in the Aeolic vernacular, but could have been Ionicized hexameter verse containing sporadic Aeolisms from everyday speech”.

Interestingly enough, the clearly Doric τέτορα is found precisely in the *WD* (698), fifteen lines after Aeolic αἶνημι (683), which means that, if

³⁹ Peters (1987) 239 pleads for an Euboean origin of λαμπράν τε σελήνην; although his contribution is full of important observations I disagree with him on this point.

Janko is right, the use of a poetic tradition based on a certain vernacular did not exclude the use of dialect forms of different origin.

16. It is highly likely that a certain amount of Hesiodic vocabulary or morphology derives *recta via* from spoken dialects; the trouble is that we do not know exactly which words or morphological features found in Hesiod are concerned. We are probably right in assuming the existence of old epic traditions based on the local dialects of, say, Delphi, Boeotia or East Aeolis, but by the time the texts we possess were composed those traditions had almost completely been overwhelmed by the Homeric type of language. Many ties link Hesiod and the Hesiodic tradition with NWG areas: we are told that the poet died in Western Locris (Thuc. 3.96), the Succession Myth is associated with a famous stone in Delphi (Th. 492–500), the Parnassus region and Opuntian Locris “figured in the very first stages of the great panhellenic construction provided by the Hesiodic *Catalogue*” (D’Alessio [2005b] 220). As many of the NHF are found in Doric-NWG dialects it is credible that some of them at least were in fact borrowed from those dialects. But we still do not know whether they were borrowed from vernaculars or local epic traditions; and it is perfectly true that e.g. ἦν (= Attic ἦσαν) proves nothing (Morpurgo Davies [1964] 141 ff.) since it is just an archaic form that must have been employed in every variety of Greek at an early stage.

Although the origin of the -ᾶς accusatives of the first declension is very uncertain, they are the only feature that seems to me to be due to a literary tradition of some kind. Three things are clear: (1) they are innovations, so they cannot be traced to very ancient poetic traditions; (2) in early Greek poetry they coexist with -ους (or -ως) accusatives of the second declension, often metrically guaranteed; (3) the texts in which this system is employed are invariably linked to the Doric world for one reason or another: for instance Tyrtaeus, Alcman, Stesichorus, Epicharmus, a Corinthian epigram, a Spartan oracle and the Rhodian χελιδονισμός.⁴⁰ In papyrus texts of archaic lyric poetry and Epicharmus the -ας accusatives of the first declension are systematically marked as

⁴⁰ Tyr. 5 West πρεσβυγενέας τε γέροντας, ἔπειτα δὲ δημότᾶς ἄνδρας, but 11.12 καὶ προμάχους ἵεναι; Alcman. PMGF 10 (b) 15 ἀγερώχως κῆρατὼς χοραγῶς (see Cassio [1993b]); Stesich. PMGF 222 (b) (Lille pap.) 247 χορησμοὺς ἀσάμους but 303 ῥίμφα δ’ [ἐνκτιμέναις] Κλεωνᾶς ἦνθον). Corinthian epigram (“Simon.” XI Page 3f. = CEG 131; 480 BC) ἐνθάδε Φοινίσσας νᾶας καὶ Πέρσας ἐλόντες καὶ Μήδους ἱερὰν Ἑλλάδα ὀυσάμεθα; Rhodian *chelidonismos*, PMG 848 καλᾶς ὥρᾶς ἄγουσα καλοὺς ἐνιαυτούς. A Spartan oracle (no. 220 Parke–Wormell) has καὶ δίκᾶς ἀλλήλοισι καὶ ἄλλοδαποῖσι

short, even if they are followed by a consonant⁴¹—which means that the Alexandrians considered -ᾶς the default form in those texts.

Since the spoken dialects tended at some point to choose either the “long” or the “short” forms for both genders (e.g. either λόγους, θύρᾶς or λόγος, θύρᾶς; Morpurgo Davies [1964] 153) the “unbalanced system” that I have just described (-ᾶς but -ους) seems to have been the hallmark of (clearly not very old) poetic traditions. As we have seen, the “unbalanced system” is amply attested in such lyric poets as Alcman and Stesichorus, and we know well that lyric poetry employed a dialect mixture which was mainly Doric with some admixture of Aeolic features due to the influence of Lesbian citharodic poetry. If we remember that hexameters proper or “quasi hexameters”⁴² played a major role in the development of the earliest stages of lyric poetry (Cassio [2005]) it is not absurd to assume some kind of exchange between the language of recited hexameters and that of lyric hexameters. Obviously the two traditions were already distinct and each one kept its fundamental linguistic characteristics: but is not impossible that at least some of the NHF were due to the influence of the Doric and Aeolic components of the language of lyric poetry.

In conclusion, the Hesiodic tradition of poetry seems to have deliberately tried to look more Homeric than Homer, but at the same time it clearly made room for a number of non-Homeric dialect features. We have seen to what extent modern scholars disagree on their evaluation: do they come from spoken dialects or from non-Homeric literary traditions? Very little can be proved. It seems likely to me that the “unbalanced system” of the accusative plurals has a literary origin and that it links the Hesiodic tradition to the traditions of lyric poetry; but the interpretation of the remaining non-Homeric features will always be surrounded by a good deal of uncertainty.⁴³

διδῶτε; Epicharmus has μωρᾶς πλευρᾶς ἀφύᾶς vs. πολλοῦς, καλλίστους (but also τός in articles; see the *Index verborum* in Kassel-Austin [2001]).

⁴¹ Alcman. *PMGF* S 5 (b) 14 σιδᾶς δύο γλυκεῖας; 162 fr. 2 (c) 5].εἰας μύρω (probably πλειᾶς μύρω) Ibyc. S 176.9 τᾶς Ἰόλαος, Epich. 113, 279 K.-A. ἀμυγδάλας 397 περιπλέας (end of line), 461 τᾶς δεκ[.

⁴² As West (1973) 188 called them, e.g. Stesich. 187.3 καὶ ῥοδίνους στεφάνους Ἴων τε κορωνίδας οὔλας.

⁴³ I am very grateful to Anna Morpurgo Davies for discussing with me some of the problems raised in this chapter, and to Frances Muecke for reading the proofs and improving my English.

HESIOD'S NARRATIVE

ANTONIOS RENGAKOS

The term “narrative” cannot be used in the same sense for the three major works attributed to Hesiod, the *Theogony*, the *Works and Days* and the *Catalogue of Women*, as it is used for the Homeric epics.¹ The Hesiodic “narrative” differs from its Homeric counterpart both in fundamental and in several particular aspects. Concerning fundamentals, Hesiod’s poems have no plot, no *mythos* in the Aristotelian sense of the term.² In other words, the foundation of all narrative, time as a sequence of (interrelated) events, is either completely absent (*Works and Days*) or more or less irrelevant to the poems’ structure (*Catalogue of Women*, *Theogony*). The difference in particulars involves, among other things, the narrator, the use of direct speech, and the insertion of digressions. I will first turn to the issue of narrativity of the three Hesiodic poems.

1. Narrativity

The *Theogony* “is an extensive catalogue with a proem; its classificatory principle is provided by the genealogies.”³ This systematic, synchronic aspect of the genealogical classification of divinities is combined with a diachronic narrative, consistently pointing to its culmination, the reign of Zeus: the subject matter of this narrative is the establishment, in three stages, of the perennial order under the supreme Olympian god’s rule. Apart from this main narrative thread, there is also a series of

¹ Lowe (2000) 82: “Hesiodic narrative . . . is a bewilderingly different experience from that of the epics, to which the poems otherwise seem so close (in date, language, and compositional techniques)”.

² On Aristotle’s absence of comments on Hesiodic poetry in the *Poetics* because of the fundamental role plot-structure plays in the philosopher’s theory see Halliwell (1986) 277–278 with n. 41, and esp. 282–283. It is still unclear whether the Hesiodic narrator falls under the category of *Poe.* 3.1448a22 ἢ ὥς τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ μεταβάλλοντα, as, e.g., Gudeman (1934) *ad loc.* and Koster (1970) 47–48 think.

³ Schwabl (1970) 441.

digressive, “para-narratives”, for instance, the birth of Aphrodite (190–206), Styx and her children (389–403), or the detailed story of Prometheus (521–616). These “para-narratives” differ in density and detail but all have nothing or very little to do with the main narrative. There are also descriptions, of places (Tartarus, 721–819), or of the *timai* of a divinity (most detailed are those of Hekate, 414–452). In this light, the *Theogony* exhibits a double character: as a catalogue, it is a descriptive text, and, as the mythos of the establishment of Zeus’ rule, it is a narrative text. The numerous chronological inconsistencies, or, in narratological terms, anachronies, may be attributed to this double character of the poem.

The *Gynaikon katalogos* is a “heroogony, structurally analogous to the *Theogony*”.⁴ It is a genealogically structured list of the “personnel” of the heroic age, from the beginnings down to the Trojan War, which caused the demise of the heroic race by the will of Zeus. In contrast to the *Theogony*, though, a central narrative, which would hold the poem together, is provided only schematically, if at all. A regularly recurring “plot of physical attraction”⁵ can hardly be considered the unifying plot of the *Catalogue* but a certain narrative development does seem to exist. A proximity to gods, thematically close to the *Theogony* and primarily exemplified in the figure of Heracles, can be detected in the first part of the poem. The second part is dominated by the “mortal” heroes of the Trojan War: the multiple appearances of the Atreids, Agamemnon and Menelaus, play a key role in this part. Thalmann ([1984] 74–75) suggests that the poem acquires in this manner a unifying “plot”, which presents history as “coherent and purposeful, perhaps with the ultimate intention (as in the myth of the Five Ages in the *Works and Days*) of explaining the present with reference to a past era—the Age of Heroes—now decisively close.” But, given the fragmentary state of the poem, the jury is still out on such matters. As in the *Theogony*, in the *Catalogue* the list of genealogies is interrupted by occasionally extensive, longer narratives of digressive nature.

⁴ Hirschberger (2004) 31. “Un vaste poème narratif” (Nasta [2006] 69) is a very unprecise characterization of the *Catalogue*.

⁵ See Osborne (2005) 14: “what drives the *Catalogue* along is men’s inability to resist an attractive woman. Women appear, and gods and men fall for them, sometimes competitively. That is the basic narrative without which there would be nothing to hold the *Catalogue* together, and that narrative is practically invariable”. For a “feminist” reading of the *Catalogue* see Doherty (2006) 297–325.

Finally, the *Works and Days* is not a narrative text but a paraenetic one.⁶ Narrative sections merely support the comprehensive argument, which is meant “to motivate the addressee . . . to adopt a certain behavior as well as to present this behavior as fundamentally right and practically possible.”⁷ The underlying “story”, the legal dispute of the narrator with his brother Perses, is nowhere narrated coherently but can only be reconstructed indirectly and in broad strokes.⁸ Two of the three “para-narratives”, which support the argument, the myth of Pandora and the myth of the five human races, are designated as *logoi*. The third, the fable of the hawk and the nightingale, is called *ainos*. These terms clearly mark the narratives as digressive insertions. The difference from heroic narrative epic becomes obvious already in the proem: while Homer deals with past events, and even the *Theogony* presents the creation of successive generations of gods, the subject of the *Works and Days* is the transmission of truth (ἐτήτυμα, 10), the appeal to justice and the call to work. In the words of J.P. Barron and P. Easterling, the *Works and Days* represents “the first attempt in western literature to compose a large-scale work without the armature of a given narrative line.”⁹

2. *Theogony*

I will now turn to the double character of the *Theogony*, which oscillates between a catalogue (II) and a narrative (III), and then I will deal with the peculiar figure of its narrator (IV). First, though, a discussion of the poem's extensive proem is in order (I). This differs markedly from traditional epic proems in that it thematizes twice and very extensively the main part of the poem.¹⁰

⁶ Ford (1992) 30. Cf. Jaeger (1934) 101 n. 1: “The poem is a single, independent, paraenetic ‘speech,’ which has been developed into an epos.” Cf. also Effe (1977) 24 n. 24.

⁷ Diller (1962 = 1966) 243.

⁸ This “story” belongs to the “plots”, which, as Don Fowler (2000) 218 showed in an important study, are “significant markers” of the genre of “didactic poetry”, to which the *Works and Days* belongs.

⁹ (1985) 100. Cf. Nünlist (2004) 31 ff. and (2007) 48 ff., who adopts the terminology of Genette and calls the *Works and Days* “pseudo-diegetic”; Nünlist offers a comprehensive narratological analysis of the narrative sections of the poem.

¹⁰ For what follows see Hamilton (1989) 10 ff.; briefly also Stoddard (2004) 65–66.

I. The second part of the proem (35 ff.), which is devoted to the Olympian Muses, lists the subjects of their different songs (44–50).¹¹ We hear that the Muses “glorify in their song first the venerated race of the gods from the beginning, those to whom Gaia and broad Ouranos gave birth”¹² (44–45), and also the younger generation of gods (46). Then (δεύτερον, 47)¹³ they sing of the power and rule of Zeus (49) and of the race of men and Giants (50).¹⁴ With the exception of the part about men and Giants, the other three parts of the Muses’ song “materialize” in lines 116 ff.: first, we hear about the children of Gaia and Ouranos (133–210), and then about their grandchildren (337–610); the next part describes in vivid detail how Zeus acquired power by means of his victory over the Titans and Typhoeus (617–880); finally, his profile as a ruler is briefly sketched (884–885).

The content of the *Theogony* is represented even more accurately in the actual *propositio thematis*, i.e. the last lines of the proem (105–115): the Muses are first asked to “glorify the sacred race of the immortals who always are” (105), which includes, again, the children of Gaia and Ouranos (106) but also those of Nyx and Pontos (107)—this is clearly associated with lines 133–210 (progeny of Gaia and Ouranos, 105), 211–232 (progeny of Nyx, 106), and 233–336 (progeny of Pontos, 107). With a brief flashback to the remotest past, there follows then the first generation of gods (θεοί, 108), who were created together with Gaia, i.e. Eros, Erebus and Nyx—this part foreshadows lines 116–132.¹⁵ The next line (111) announces the third generation of gods, the children of the Titans, who are listed in lines 337–616. The last two lines of this summary of contents (112–113) sketch 617–880 (Titanomachy

¹¹ The so-called “first Theogony” of the proem (11–20) is generally viewed as presenting in inverse order the main part of the poem (116 ff.): see von Fritz (1956) 34 (= Heitsch [1966] 301); Nagy (1982) 55; Lamberton (1988) 55 f.; Schwabl (1966) 24. There are, though, substantial differences between the two parts, as West *ad loc.* and Hamilton (1989) 12 correctly observe, so that in the case of 11–20 one should speak of an exposition rather than a presentation in genealogical terms.

¹² All translations are by G.W. Most (2006) and (2007).

¹³ Zeus is the second subject of the poem; δεύτερον does not imply a hierarchical ordering; see Nagy (1982) 55, against West on *Th.* 48 (pp. 172–173).

¹⁴ This is hardly a “generic catalogue”, in the sense that lines 45–46 are a miniature Theogony, 47 ff. hymnal poetry, and 50 a heroic epic and a Gigantomachy, as von Fritz (1956/1966) has suggested. On the song about the races of men and Giants, which is not found in the actual Theogony, see West *ad loc.*

¹⁵ In keeping these lines and in their interpretation I follow Neitzel (1975) 118 ff., esp. 120–122, and Marg (1970) 102–103. West *ad loc.* also considers them genuine. Following previous scholars (e.g. Friedländer [1914] 12 [= Heitsch 1966, 290, n. 19]), Hamilton (1989) 15 n. 19 (p. 108) and Lenz (1980) 138 n. 1 delete them.

and Typhonomachy, i.e. the victory of the Olympians over their opponents) and 881–885 (the division of τιμαί).¹⁶

This strikingly exhaustive summary of the poem's contents is unique in archaic epic. Traditionally, an epic proem mentions the poem's subject but it never includes specific information on its content: "a proem is not a table of contents."¹⁷ Yet this is precisely what the last lines of the *Theogony* proem just discussed present. As is well known, the Iliadic proem describes in very general terms the devastating consequences of Achilles' wrath for the Achaeans. In the Odyssean proem, there is a vagueness, which has often been observed and variously interpreted, concerning the main subject of the poem, the return home of the hero (who is not even named until line 21), the killing of the suitors and Odysseus' reunion with his family. A similar case is the song of Demodocus: only the "love" of Ares and Aphrodite is mentioned as its subject (*Od.* 8.267–269) with, again, no word about the cunning revenge of Hephaestus, although the main part of the song is devoted to it.¹⁸ True to the catalogue form of the poem, the end of the proem of the *Theogony* does not simply *state* the poem's subject, but *lists* the main parts of the gods' genealogy the poem will provide.¹⁹

Another constituent element of an epic proem is the specification of the narrative's point of departure. In this respect, too, the repeated announcements of the *Theogony* proem according to which the narrative will start "from the beginning" are remarkable. This information is provided in the so-called "second *Theogony*" of the proem (44–52; ἐξ ἀρχῆς,

¹⁶ Concerning the much-discussed problem of the "genuine" end of the *Theogony*, a definitive answer is virtually impossible (cf. Most [2006] il). From a structural point of view, in any case, West's stylistic objections (398) against the genuineness of lines 901 ff. are not justified. As Marg (1970) 21 correctly points out: "what he considers as the different, non-Hesiodic style of the part after Metis is closely interrelated with the compressed and symmetrical catalogue form, which can be a very authentic use of the versatile catalogue form." I view the entire transmitted *Theogony* as a "meaningful whole" (Schwabl [1970] 453).

¹⁷ Bassett (1923) 347.

¹⁸ On the proems of the two Homeric epics see also van Groningen (1946) esp. 287: "Homer does not talk about the course of events itself; there is no real summary of the contents"; Rüter (1969) 28–52; Race (1992); Walsh (1995); Danek (1998) 29 ff.

¹⁹ Such an overview of the content of the poem is also found in the famous *anakephalaiosis* of the *Odyssey* (23.310–343), in which the hero summarizes the *apologoi* for Penelope. The scholia on *Th.* 116 call this summary by exactly this term: Ἡσίοδος ἐνταῦθα ἄρχεται τῆς θεογονίας, τοῦ προομίου καὶ τοῦ τῶν Μουσῶν ἐγκωμίου καὶ τῆς ἀνακεφαλαιώσεως πανσάμενος. On ancient discussions about the proem of the *Theogony*, see Montanari, this volume, 319f.

45) discussed above, and, with great insistence, also at the beginning and end of the *propositio thematis* (105–115):²⁰ the appeal to the Muses to sing “how in the first place gods and earth were born” (ὥς τὰ πρῶτα θεοὶ καὶ γαῖα ἐγένοντο, 108) is taken up, after the summary of the main part of the poem mentioned above, in the final lines of the proem: “these things tell me from the beginning ... and tell which one of them was born first” (114–115: ταῦτά μοι ἔσπετε ... / ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ εἰπαθ’ ὅτι πρῶτον γένετ’ αὐτῶν). Even if determined by the theogonic subject of the poem, the contrast with the Homeric *in-medias-res* technique is striking.

II. As announced, the main part of the poem begins with the “very first” beginnings (ἦτοι μὲν πρότιστα, 116), and the general direction is by and large chronological. On the one hand, there are in all four (not explicitly enumerated) generations: the first includes the offspring of Chaos and Gaia, the second the offspring of Gaia’s children, i.e. of Ouranos and Pontos, the third the grandchildren of Ouranos and Pontos (Zeus and his siblings, among others), and the fourth the children of the Olympians. At the same time, the succession myth of Ouranos, Kronos and Zeus is inserted into this chain of generations. On the other hand, the presentation of the whole is by no means linear throughout: as mentioned above, the time-determined narrative of the succession myth is constantly interrupted by the largely time-indifferent character of the genealogical catalogue.

Concerning the ordering principles of the catalogue, patrilinearity is the order of the day in the main genealogical line, in other words in the listing of the offspring of the multi-branched family of Gaia, which is much more significant in the *Theogony* than the relatively smaller family of Chaos: sons predominate while females are mentioned only in connection with their marriages. The genealogical principle is consistently used in lines 116–937: the descent of all beings mentioned in this part of the poem may be traced back, both patrilinearly and matrilinearly, to Gaia and Chaos. The presentation of the genealogical trees begins from the same generational level, but in individual branches the listing progresses down to the generation of grandchildren (e.g. 404 ff. Hekate, granddaughter of Phoibe and Koios), or even down to the age of heroes (e.g., the catalogue of monsters mentions Heracles as the vanquisher of Geryoneus, a great-grandson of Phorkys and Keto [289 ff.]; the same hero

²⁰ Cf. Neitzel (1975) 120.

vanquishes Hydra [313 ff.] and the Nemean lion [327 ff.], both grandchildren of Phorkys and Keto). Obviously, the preservation of strict chronological order is not one of the poet's concerns. A clear proof of that is provided by the fact that the presentation often involves individuals not yet born. For instance, in the case of the offspring of Phorkys and Keto just mentioned, Poseidon, who mates with Medusa in lines 278 ff., is not "born" until 453; Kallirhoe, who bears Geryoneus to Chrysaor in 287 ff., is not born until 351; even more strikingly, Heracles, the vanquisher of several monsters (289, 315, 318, 332), is born only at 943. To speak of "prolepses" in such cases is to disregard the non-narrative character of the genealogical catalogue.²¹

The chronological framework in the *Theogony* is also undermined by other elements. The most important is analogy, "a most essential means of expression in Hesiod."²² It not only appears prominently in the three parts of the succession myth but, as shown mainly by Schwabl and Thalmann,²³ it also permeates parts of the genealogical catalogue, e.g., among many others, the sections on the Oceanids (240 ff.) and the Nereids (337 ff.), as well as the final parts of the sections on Styx (371–382) and Hekate (404–415). By virtue of their correspondence and of the similarity of their presentation, different sections of the catalogue become associated with one another without explicit indication of their association. Thus, the meaning of the different parts of the *Theogony* "is not limited to explicit formulations but consists mainly in the ordering of the whole and its parts ... which produces meaning through analogy and contrast."²⁴

The use of ring-composition also undermines the linear development of the presentation. In a sort of framing ring-composition, the poem begins and ends with the present state of the world under Zeus' rule (proem and lines 881–992). The birth of the Muses also forms a similarly all-encompassing cycle (lines 53–67 and 915–917). Moreover, scattered throughout the poem are numerous hints at the present power and rule of Zeus that precede the actual narration of their establishment. So, for instance, the earth is called "the ever immovable seat of all immortals who possess snowy Olympus' peak and murky Tartarus" immediately upon its creation (117–118).²⁵ To the same category belong lines 285–286 about Pegasus, who "dwells in Zeus' house", and lines 402–403, where, at

²¹ Stoddard (2004) 145 ff.; well-argued criticism in Nünlist (2007) 40–41.

²² Schwabl (1970) 457.

²³ (1970) 453 ff. and (1984) 25 ff., respectively.

²⁴ Schwabl (1970) 45.

²⁵ Clay (2003) 15.

the end of the story of Styx, it is said of Zeus (who will only be “born” in 457): “and he himself rules mightily and reigns”. There is a similar formulation at the end of the story about Kronos (“relying on these, he [i.e. Zeus] rules over mortals and immortals”, 506), or at the end of Prometheus’ story (“thus it is not possible to deceive or elude the mind of Zeus”, 613). This category also includes 458 “by whose [i.e. Zeus’] thunder the broad earth is shaken” or the references to the eternally valid division of τιμαί among the gods (e.g., of the Oceanids [348], of Styx [391 ff.], or of Hekate [421 ff.]).

III. As already suggested, the actual “plot” of the *Theogony* consists in the narration of the succession myth, which unfolds in four narrative sections that interrupt the genealogical catalogue: in 154–210 we learn of the castration and deposition of Ouranos by Kronos, in 459–506 of the deception and deposition of Kronos by Zeus, and in 617–819 (Titanomachy) and 820–885 (defeat of Typhoeus) of the definitive consolidation of Zeus’ rule. This narration is then clearly directed toward a *telos*. Its consistency is further enhanced in three ways. First, through analogy (depositions of two tyrannical fathers by their youngest sons), which introduces suspense as to the ultimate success of Zeus’ attempt;²⁶ by describing in detail not only the two victorious battles (against the Titans and Typhoeus) but also the swallowing of Metis by Zeus, the narrator is able to highlight the thwarted threat of a third deposition and succession, which is about to happen according to the narrative blueprint already outlined twice in the course of the poem. Second, the concept of τίσις runs through the entire narrative: from the “bloody drops”, which bring out the gruesomeness of Kronos’ attack on his father, are born the Erinyes, the spirits of vengeful wrath, while Ouranos himself prophesies to his children that “they had strained to perform a mighty deed in their wickedness, and that at some later time there would be vengeance for this” (209–210). So, Kronos and the Titans pay for the crime they committed with the attack on their father Ouranos. Third, the role of Gaia also promotes unity. She has been justifiably called “the actual driving force of the plot”:²⁷ “she urges Kronos to castrate and depose Ouranos and creates bronze for the fashioning of the requisite weapon; she communicates to Rhea the ruse for saving the infant Zeus and raises the saved child herself in Crete; she keeps lightning and thunderbolts hidden until the time of

²⁶ Thalmann (1984) 42–43.

²⁷ Robert (1905/1966) 171.

decision comes (505); on her advice, Zeus frees the Hundred-Handers, on her advice, he is recognized as ruler of the world by his siblings, on her advice, he swallows Metis" — "she is the actual heroine of the *Theogony*."²⁸

Hesiod's narrative technique is most similar to Homer's in the so-called Titanomachy (617–720): "the Titanomachy is the center-piece with which Hesiod meant to secure for his poem the character of a narrative epic."²⁹ After a short flashback to lines 147–159 (Ouranos' grudge against the Hundred-Handers), the story begins shortly before the decisive battle, which comes at the end of ten years of fighting between the Titans and the Kronids. The winning over of the Hundred-Handers involves an epic scene, which includes their reception on Olympus and two quite extensive direct speeches, the address of Zeus (642–653) and the reply of Kottos (654–663). The description of the battle follows the Homeric pattern,³⁰ with alternation of mass engagements and duels, which should be thought to take place simultaneously.³¹

IV. The Homeric narrator is external ("he belongs to a much later time than the events he is recounting ... he does not himself play a role in those events"), omniscient ("he knows ... the outcome of events beforehand ... he has access to the inner thoughts and emotions of his characters"), omnipresent ("he recounts what happens among the gods on Mount Olympus and among the heroes on earth etc."), undramatized ("we hear nothing about his personality") and for the most part covert ("he does not refer to his own activities as a narrator and focalizer and rarely ... openly expresses judgements").³² The Hesiodic narrator in the *Theogony* is essentially similar to his Homeric counterpart, but there are certainly some significant differences between the two.³³ These differences appear most clearly in the proem: in this short piece, he is a dramatized, internal narrator, since he features as a character in his own story. His presence is most explicit in the "autobiographic" so-called *Dichterweihe* (22–34), in which he even names himself, in sharp contrast to the conventions of epic. The presence of the narrator is also underscored by the announcement of his intention, in the first

²⁸ Robert (1905/1966) 172.

²⁹ von Wilamowitz (1928b) 369.

³⁰ Pace Pucci, this volume; cf. Blaise-Rousseau (1996), esp. 219 ff.

³¹ Frazer (1981) 5–9.

³² de Jong (2004) 14; (2001) 5.

³³ For the following see the excellent discussion of Nünlist (2004) 25 ff.; cf. also Stoddard (2004) 34 ff.

person plural, to sing of the Heliconian Muses, already in line 1; by the break-off formula in 35, whose specific meaning remains enigmatic; by the repetition of the intention to begin the poem “with the Muses”, this time those of Olympus, (again ἀρχώμεθα) in 36, and, finally, by the extensive appeal to the Muses in 104 ff.

In the main part of the poem, the narrator is in some respects less and in others more prominent than his Homeric counterpart. On the one hand, he never addresses a character (with the exception of the use of τοι in 126, 448, 873, 986, 1015), expresses only one counterfactual judgement (“if not”-situation, 836–838), has fewer cases of “presentation through negation”³⁴ than Homer, and provides fewer explanations (mainly “etymologies”, e.g. 195 ff., 234–235). On the other hand, he uses evaluative language or emotional terms in his own name (590–612, 635 ff.), which, as is well known, are restricted in Homer to direct speeches. Moreover, narrator commentaries are fairly common in the *Theogony*; most prominent are the commentaries on the discourse (e.g. 35, 234 [καλέουσι]), the summing up formulas (263–264, 336, 362–363, 448–449, 613) and the recognition of the limitations of his knowledge (369–370).

3. *Catalogue of Women*

The Hesiodic *Gynaikon Katalogos*, which we are able to better survey and more correctly appreciate thanks to several recent works,³⁵ will also be examined mainly from the point of view of structure and unity (I). Various narrative techniques will also be discussed, primarily those that show similarities with the Homeric narrative (II).

I. Genealogy is the defining structural principle of the *Catalogue of Women*: the poem presents “a synthesis, in five genealogical trees, of various regional genealogies, which encompasses the entire heroic age from Prometheus and the flood down to the demise of the heroic race and the division of gods and men.”³⁶ As far as one can judge from the extant fragments, the five genealogical trees (the Aioliids, the Inachids and the descendants of Io, the Arcadians and the descendants of Kallisto,

³⁴ de Jong (2004) 22.

³⁵ Rutherford (2000), (2005), Hirschberger (2004), Hunter (2005a), see also Tsagalis, this volume.

³⁶ Hirschberger (2004) 67–68.

the Atlantids or Pleiades, and the Asopids) are divided among the first four books, while the fifth dealt with the suitors of Helen and the plan of Zeus for the end of the heroic age. Beside genealogy, geography seems to have played a role in the structure of the poem: “if we take the geographical centres of gravity in each genealogy, we find that there is a general progression from west to east across Greece.”³⁷ The genealogical structure of the *Catalogue* seems to clash with the formula ἦ' οἴη, which appears sporadically,³⁸ and was originally used to introduce successive paradigms of mythological women. In the Hesiodic *Catalogue* it has become a secondary, additional structural means, as West (1985) 47 and 56 has shown, which facilitates the return to an earlier point within a genealogy or the insertion of longer narrative sections.³⁹

The timeframe of the poem is specified in the proem: the poem deals with a past era (two τότε at 3 and 6), the age of heroes, in which gods and men “shared meals and seats” (6) and the immortals mated with mortal women. The invocation to the Muses and the description of women and their time (1–13) are followed by a catalogue of gods (the first to be named is Zeus, then Poseidon, Ares etc.) who mated with mortal women (15 ff.). The end of the heroic age comes by means of the plan of Zeus, after the birth of Helen's daughter. The temporal marker resumes the formulation of the proem in the manner of a ring-composition that frames the poem: fr. 1.6–7 M.-W. (= 1.6–7 Hirschberger) ξυναι γὰρ τότε δαῖτες ἔσαν ξυνοὶ δὲ θύωκοι/ἀθανάτοις τε θεοῖσι καταθνητοῖς τ' ἀνθρώποις ~ fr. 204.102–103 M.-W. (= 110.102–103 H.) ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν μάκαρες ... ὥς τὸ πάρος περ / χωρὶς ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων [βίοντον κα]ὶ ἦθε' ἔχουσιν.⁴⁰ The *Catalogue* begins then in the oldest time and continues through Deukalion with the first genealogical tree, that of the Aeolids. As already suggested, it seems in this manner “to aspire to encompass the entire temporal and spatial horizon of the heroic age” (Hirschberger [2004] 68). Each tree marks a new beginning, and within the trees the different generations are presented in two ways: horizontally (members of the same generation are listed together, first the daughters, then the sons), and vertically (the descendants are listed, often in a sort of *hysteron*

³⁷ West (1985) 166 with detailed references.

³⁸ The passages in which the formula occurs (according to Arrighetti [2008a], 14 n. 10): fr. 23a, 3; 26.5; 43a, 2 (conjectured); 58.7; 59.2; 181; 195.8 (= *Scut.* 1); 215.1; 253 and possibly also in the context of fr. 229.

³⁹ On the “archaeology” of the formula ἦ' οἴη cf. Rutherford (2004) 83 ff.

⁴⁰ The mythical time-span covered in the *Catalogue* fluctuates between 17 generations (Inachids) and 4 to 10 (Athenians and Atlantids); see West (1985) 177 ff.

proteron, i.e. the descendants of the person mentioned last are listed first). In any case, the limits of the “dramatic time” indicated above (from the oldest time to the eve of the Trojan War) are often transgressed. For instance, there are references to participants in the Trojan War,⁴¹ who were not Helen’s suitors and are thus omitted from the catalogue of her suitors at the end (fr. 35 M.-W. [= 26a H.]: Nestor’s sons Thrasymedes and Antilochus; fr. 141 M.-W. [= 56 H.]: Sarpedon and his death; fr. 136 M.-W. [= *6 H.]: Euchenor’s participation in the war [and his death?]; fr. 212b M.-W. [= 99 H.]: Achilles’ death at the Scaean gates and his future fame). There are even references to events that took place after the war (fr. 23a.29–30 M.-W. [= 15 H.]: Clytaemestra’s murder by Orestes after a brief mention of the sacrifice of “Iphimede” at Aulis by the Achaeans).

The latest scholarly contributions strongly emphasize “the fundamental unifying concept”, “the systematic plan”, which turns the individual *Ehoiai* into parts of an organic whole (Hirschberger [2004] 47 and West [1985] 122)—the notion of “a naïve list in catalogue form” (Marg [1970] 375) is now out of fashion. As already pointed out (p. 204 above), the thematic unity of the *Catalogue of Women* is also detected in the conscious striving of the poet to depict a gradual progression from a world akin to that of the *Theogony* to a world close to that of the Homeric epics.⁴² In the beginning of the poem the special closeness to gods is embodied in the figure of Heracles (death and apotheosis of the hero: fr. 25.23–33 M.-W. [= 16 H.]) and stressed through the frequent mention of unions between gods and mortal women (e.g. Apollo’s son Melaneus and Stratonice: fr. 26.22 ff. M.-W. [= 17.22 ff. H.]; Poseidon and Tyro: fr. 30.31 ff.; 31 M.-W. [= 20.31 ff., 24 H.]). A further element that brings out the closeness with the *Theogony* are the Deukalionids, whose line includes monstrous and magical persons: the Siamese twins, Kteatos and Eurytos in fr. 17a M.-W. [= 11 H.], the shape-changers, Periclymenos, fr. 33a M.-W. [= 25 H.], and Mestra, fr. 43a M.-W. [= 37 H.]. The second part of the poem is dominated by Trojan War heroes, especially by Agamemnon and Menelaus, who appear repeatedly. The figure of Zeus also seems to undergo a change within the *Catalogue*: he punishes Salmoneus, who dares to compete with him (fr. 30.23 M.-W. [= 20.23 H.]), with lightning and thunder, in the manner of the *Theogony*, while at

⁴¹ Hirschberger (2004) 54–55.

⁴² See Davies (1992) 100 ff., Haubold (2005) 94 ff. Clay (2003) 168 also agrees but she stresses rather the mediating position of the *Catalogue* between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.

the end of the poem he activates his plans for the extermination of the heroic race only indirectly, by means of the Trojan War.

Concerning the individual genealogical entries, the *Catalogue* is conspicuous for its “colorful variety in presentation” (Marg [1970] 397):⁴³ the entries differ markedly in scope and detail. A typical entry falls into three parts:⁴⁴ the first includes the *Vorstellung* (the “introduction of the main character”), the second narrates the union with a god or mortal (*Zeugungsmythos*, “procreation myth”), and the third deals with the descendants (*Nachkommenschaft*). Particularly interesting are the frequent extensive narratives, which, as will be suggested below (II), feature several sophisticated narrative techniques used also in the Homeric epics. They may stretch to 4 lines (e.g. the first, non-genealogical passage in fr. 10a.55–58 M.-W. [= 5.55–58 H.], which presents a “plot” different from the *Zeugungsmythos* and the *Nachkommenschaft*: Oeneus’ son Tydeus kills the sons of Agrios or of Pylos), 15 lines (fr. 10a.83–96 M.-W. [= 5.83–96 H.]: the story of the metamorphosis of Ceyx and Alcyone into birds), more than 40 (fr. 30.4–35 M.-W. [= 20.4–35 H.] with fr. 31 and 32 M.-W. [= 24 and 23 H.]: the story of Salmoneus and Tyro) or even a little more than 90 (fr. 43a [= 37 H.]: the story of Mestra). Their distribution within the *Catalogue* seems to have been irregular, although the more extensive ones tend to occupy the end of genealogical stemmas, as West (1985) 49–50 has observed. Representative examples are the story of Atalanta at the end of the Aiolos line (fr. 75–76 M.-W. [= 3–4 H.]), the story of Phineus at the end of the stemma of Io (fr. 150–157 M.-W. [= 63, 62, 64, 65 H.]), the *ehoie* of Alcmena at the end of the stemma of the Pleiades (fr. 195 M.-W. [*Scut.* 1–56] [= 91 H.]), and above all the catalogue of the suitors of Helen at the end of book 5.⁴⁵ In the *Catalogue of Women* it seems “as if the poet were deliberately trying to give the impression of a naïve, preliterate form” (Rutherford [2004] 93) by various means: the frequent, irregular insertion of narrative passages of varying scope in the poem’s main catalogic framework (in fr. 10a M.-W. [= 5 H.] the first 80 lines are “pure” genealogical catalogue poetry, followed by the insertion of the story of Ceyx and Alcyone, which takes up 15 lines), the immediate juxtaposition of brief and extensive narratives (cf., e.g., in fr. 43a M.-W.

⁴³ Hunter (2005b) 253: “it is clear that the narrative texture of the poem was uneven”.

⁴⁴ According to Trüb (1952) 54; mostly similar Davies (1992) 88 ff.

⁴⁵ There are exceptions to this “rule”: while the detailed *ehoie* of Mestra (fr. 43a.2–48 M.-W. [= 37.2–48 H.]) is placed towards the end of the Aeolid stemma, the long story of Peleus (fr. 96–100 H., fr. 209, 212b, 211 M.-W.) occurs in the middle of the Asopid stemma.

[= 37 H.] the direct juxtaposition of the stories of Mestra and Eurynome), or the generally rapid narrative tempo. This impression of the poem's lack of artistry is refuted by closer examination of the text, which reveals the poem to be "a consciously fashioned narrative artwork" (Hirschberger [2004] 47).

II. Most striking among the "Homeric" narrative techniques in the *Catalogue of Women* is the very rare use of direct speeches. There are very few certain instances:⁴⁶ fr. 31.1(?)–5 M.-W. (= 24.–5 H.) (Poseidon announces to Tyro the birth and brilliant future of the children she will bear him); in fr. 43.41–43 M.-W. (= 37.41–43 H.) a "law" is quoted (by Athena?), which settles the dispute between Sisyphus and Aithon over Mestra; fr. 165.1–3 M.-W. (= 72.1–3 H.) belongs perhaps to the end of a speech (of Apollo and Poseidon) to Teuthras, and in fr. 211.7–13 M.-W. (= 100.7–13 H.) the people greet the newly-wed Peleus upon his entrance in Iolcus. A similar, non-Homeric sparseness in the use of direct speeches is also observed in the *Theogony*, which features only 4 instances: the Muses' address to Hesiod (26–28), the exchange of Gaia and Kronos (164–172), the exchange of Zeus and Prometheus (543–549) and the exchange of Zeus and Kottos, the leader of the Hundred-Handers (644–663). Noteworthy is the observation made by Rutherford (2000) 88 to the effect that, in a poem dominated by women, no female character makes a direct speech, at least as far as we can judge.

The *Catalogue of Women* makes frequent use of a "Homeric" narrative technique, that of analepsis or, in the terminology of the Homeric scholia, ἐξ ἀναστροφῆς,⁴⁷ primarily in connection with the various parts of Heracles' "biography", which are scattered throughout the poem. Haubold has shown that "Heracles lives his life backwards. The first major fragment that we can place deals with his death and apotheosis (fr. 25 M.-W. [= 16 H.]), the last one with his birth (fr. 195 M.-W. [= 91 H.])."⁴⁸ In

⁴⁶ See Hunter (2005b) 251. It is unclear whether fr. 41 M.-W. (= *23 H.) (a half-line of direct speech) belongs to the *Catalogue of Women* or to the *Cheironos Hypothekai* (Hirschberger [2004] 483). Fr. 75.13–25 M.-W. (= *3.13–25 H.) (Schoineus announces the terms of the contest for Atalante) and fr. 76.9–10 M.-W. (= *4.9–10 H.) (Hippomenes addresses Atalante) depend on the ascription of the *ehoie* of Atalante to the *Catalogue of Women*, which has been recently questioned again by Hirschberger (2004) 460–461. Fr. 89 M.-W. (= 55 H.) belongs perhaps to a revelation similar to that of Poseidon in fr. 31 M.-W. (= 24 H.) (Hirschberger [2004] 240), and fr. 136.7 ff. (= *6.7 ff. H.) may contain a prophecy or oracle cited in direct speech.

⁴⁷ Cf. Rengakos (2004); Hunter (2009); Nünlist (2009).

⁴⁸ Haubold (2005) 185. On the basis of this observation, Haubold makes far-reaching

between there appear important deeds of the hero such as the capture of Oechalia (fr. 26 M.-W. [= 17 H.]), Pylos (fr. 33–35 M.-W. [= 25–26, 26c, 26b H.]), Cos (fr. 43a M.-W. [= 37 H.]), Troy (fr. 165 M.-W. [= 72 H.]), or his *athloi* (fr. 190 M.-W. [= 89 H.]). This kind of “anastrophic narrative” may also be observed in briefer passages. Particularly impressive is the initial part of the *ehoie* of Alcmene, which features several flashbacks.⁴⁹ For instance, the reason for the exile of Alcmene and Amphitryon to Thebes (1 ff.), Amphitryon’s killing of Alcmene’s father, is revealed afterwards (9 ff.) etc. Similarly, fr. 26.31 ff. M.-W. (= 17.31 ff. H.) deals with the fate of Iole (and the destruction of Oechalia) but these form the background to the events narrated in fr. 25.20 ff. M.-W. (= 16.20 ff. H.), i.e. Deianeira’s poisoning of Heracles, and in fr. 229 M.-W. (= 93 H.) Heracles’ apotheosis is mentioned first and his river struggle (whether against Achelous or Nessus) afterwards.⁵⁰

If one overlooks the peculiar, reverse direction of Heracles’ biography, this biography is also an example of another compositional technique, which is used especially in the *Odyssey*: it has long been observed⁵¹ that the various *nostos*-stories (of Nestor in book 3, of Menelaus in 4, of Agamemnon in 11 or 24) are artfully distributed in separate parts, which are keyed to each other and whose content ultimately produces a coherent picture. The *Catalogue of Women* also deals with portions of the three great epic sagas (the Argonautic, the Theban, and the Trojan) in different parts and from various perspectives.⁵² The fragmentary state of the poem does not allow a definitive judgement as to the coherence of the resulting pictures. At least in some cases it is certain that the individual parts of the story were interrelated (e.g. fr. 193 and 195 M.-W. [= 90, 91 H.]; similarly, the details of the myth of Alcmene complement each other; see Marg [1970] 482).

The narrative form of the catalogue, which is used twice, in a sort of a “catalogue-within-a-catalogue” technique, also has Homeric anteced-

claims to the effect that Heracles is not only the connecting link between the world of the *Theogony* and that of the heroic epic but at the same time the symbol of the undermining of the clear differentiation between the two. This last claim is questionable or rather too postmodern.

⁴⁹ Marg (1970) 480.

⁵⁰ In fr. 27 also the story of the daughters of Proetus is narrated “from the end backwards” (Hirschberger [2004] 249).

⁵¹ Geffcken (1927) 1–23; especially on *Odyssey* cf. Heubeck (1954) 18 ff.; Hölscher (1990), esp. 100–101; Danek (1998) 80.

⁵² Marg (1970) 409, 464–465, 474–475; Hirschberger (2004) 54–58.

ents. It appears in fr. 150–157 M.-W. (= 63, 62, 64, 65, 62 H.), in the so-called γῆς περίοδος or in the description of the route around the earth, which the Boreads traverse in pursuit of the Harpies, as they travel to Kephallenia through the lands of numerous exotic and fabulous people. The geographic-ethnographic coloring of this catalogue is reminiscent of Circe's instructions in the *Odyssey* (15.39 ff.) or of Zeus' gazing over the people of the north in the *Iliad* (13.4–5). The Homeric legacy is even more conspicuous in the catalogue of Helen's suitors (fr. 196–204 M.-W. [= 104–106, 108–109, 107, 110.25, *25, 110 H.),⁵³ which is constructed along geographical lines, like the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships. Suitors from the same region are grouped together and the various regions are arranged clockwise, starting from the Peloponnese and ending with Crete (or Rhodes). In sharp contrast to the rest of the poem, the catalogue of suitors is centered around men and thus marks thematically its closeness to the Homeric-epic world. Finally, it is worth pointing out that the genealogical principle, which organizes the rest of the poem, is also present, to a more limited extent, in the two catalogues just mentioned: the origin of both the various people in the γῆς περίοδος and the suitors of Helen is regularly noted in our surviving fragments.

⁵³ Cingano (2005); Arrighetti (2008a) 22–23.

CALLIMACHUS HESIODICUS REVISITED

EVINA SISTAKOU

The three faces of Hesiodic poetry, the theogonic, the didactic and the genealogical, along with the alluring persona of their creator, held a great fascination for the neoterics of Alexandria. Callimachus and Aratus were regarded by their contemporaries as the “New Hesiods” of the age, and it is a common assumption that “Hesiodism”, as an alternative to “Homerism”, was a general trend in Hellenistic, and, subsequently, Roman poetics.¹ The epics of the Hesiodic corpus had a series of archaic features that attracted poets as diverse as Callimachus, Aratus, Apollonius, Theocritus, Eratosthenes, Euphorion, Alexander Aitolus, Hermesianax, Nicander, Virgil, Propertius and Ovid. Thematically, Hesiodic myths are clearly divergent from their Homeric counterparts; while the Homeric epics focus on archetypal, full-scale narrations about heroic wars and returns, the poet of the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue* opts for arcane stories about the birth of gods, their conflicts and their love affairs, mainly with heroines, in highly selective narratives. Hesiodic poetry raises significant issues concerning religion, divine and human justice and the problem of violence, and offers moral and practical guidance on the harsh realities of everyday life; moreover, the model of the poet who makes his voice clearly heard on these matters had a profound impact on the way Hellenistic poets individualized their own poetic voices. Generic forms, such as the *Kollektivgedicht*, or the aitiological perspective and the thematization of “learning” so popular in Hellenistic literature seem also to have originated from the tradition of Hesiod. On the other hand, the didactic stance of the narrator in the *Works and Days* undoubtedly motivated a series of (pseudo)didactic epics on various disciplines in Alexandria and Rome. Even much-discussed episodes of the Hesiodic epics, including the encounter with the Heliconian Muses, and the deeply effective

¹ “Hesiodism” is succinctly termed by Schroeder (2006) 288–290 to describe a literary phenomenon of the Hellenistic era. On Callimachus as the “New Hesiod”, see Hunter (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004] 51–54). On Aratus as the “Hellenistic Hesiod”, see Fakas (2001).

personifications of abstract concepts—like Dike—are reworked in numerous Hellenistic poems.²

However, since Hesiodic influence on Hellenistic poetics is so extensive and multifaceted, I have limited my discussion to the leading personality of the Alexandrian neoterics, Callimachus of Cyrene. My aim is not to fill a bibliographical gap on the subject, as scholars have already scrutinized the majority of the explicit references and intertextual allusions to Hesiodic passages that pervade his poetic oeuvre; I rather intend to “update” older views in accordance with modern theoretical approaches, and, hopefully, help re-evaluate common misconceptions about the matter. For example, the widespread credo that Callimachus modelled his neoteric *leptotes* upon Hesiodic poetics seems to be based primarily upon two of his most famous (but also misinterpreted) passages, in both of which the poet of Ascræ is referred to by name: the scene of the dream introducing the *Aitia* (*Somnium* fr. 2 Pf.) and Epigram 27 dedicated to the praise of Aratus’ *Phainomena*.³ Among the staunch supporters of this view was Erich Reitzenstein, who in his 1931 article argued that Callimachus wrote his *Aitia* in the *genus tenue* of Hesiodic epic style as a reaction to the *genus grande* of the Homeric tradition. Kambylis suggested similar connections between the *Aitia* and the growing Hesiodism of the age in his 1965 monograph on the reception of the proem of the *Theogony* as an archetypal scene of poetic initiation (“Dichterweihe”) by Callimachus, Ennius and Propertius. Along the same lines, but on a much broader scale, Reinsch-Werner (1976) treated “Callimachus Hesiodicus” as a paradigm of straightforward imitation of his archaic predecessor. In her monograph, she pinpoints a series of Callimachean passages, mainly from the hymns, which expressly evoke Hesiod; she then traces a host of

² Although this is hardly the right place for a thorough survey, I have listed here some basic bibliographical data on the subject. Two monographs explore Hesiod as a model poet for Callimachus (Reinsch-Werner [1976]) and Aratus (Fakas [2001]); on Aratus challenging the Hesiodic pedagogic principles, see Semanoff (2006). For Apollonius fundamental is the analysis of Campbell (1981); cf. the discussion of the catalogue of the Argonauts against the background of Homer and Hesiod in Roth (2004). On Theocritus’ Lycidas in *Idyll* VII recalling the archetypal figure of Hesiod, see Schwinge (1974); on the Hellenistic and Roman motif of the initiation into poetry in the manner of Hesiod, see Kambylis (1965) and Wright (1983). Alexander Aitolus is examined from a Hesiodic perspective by Schroeder (2006).

³ On the discussion of the two passages, and generally on the scholarly *topos* that Callimachus was Hesiod’s most devoted fan, see Cameron’s (1995) 362–379 heavily criticizing review of the relevant bibliography, mainly Reitzenstein (1931) and Reinsch-Werner (1976).

verbal reminiscences and concludes by highlighting Callimachean allusions to memorable scenes, genealogies, and also proverbial expressions and sayings of Hesiodic provenance. Although valuable as a source book to be used as a basis for research, Reinsch-Werner's monograph avoids theoretical approaches and categorizations, thus failing to appreciate the bigger picture of Hesiodic-Callimachean poetics. Cameron seems to be the only scholar to downplay the significance of Hesiod for Callimachus' aesthetic; in a chapter under the title "Hesiodic elegy", Cameron suggests that in writing the *Aitia*, Callimachus was in effect criticizing his contemporaries for writing catalogue elegies that mechanically reproduced Hesiodic style; within this context, the approval of the *Phainomena* by Callimachus should be interpreted as a confirmation of Aratus' ability to avoid the commonplace and unrefined features of the Hesiodic manner.⁴ More moderate than sceptical, Hunter addresses the *Theogony* as one of the significant models of the *Aitia*, in terms of choice of subject matter (the coming into being of world-order is refashioned as a series of learned aitiologies) and poetic attitude (the *Aitia* is designed as a sequel to the Hesiodic epic).⁵

Reconsidering Callimachus from a Hesiodic viewpoint is not an easy task, given that previous bibliography appears exhaustive in scope but, in most cases, inconclusive as regards its results. Thus, the present paper does not offer an anthology of scholarly clichés on the subject, but aims primarily to revisit well-known "Hesiodic" passages from new angles, and discuss novel ones, in order to re-assess to what extent Callimachus really was "Hesiodicus". The following discussion is divided into three sections, each one of which deals with a key aspect of Hesiodic reception by Callimachus: the formation of a poetic voice, the narration of myths and the questioning of ideals.⁶

⁴ Cameron (1995) 362–386.

⁵ Hunter in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 51–60.

⁶ For passages deriving from Callimachus' *Hymns* and *Iambi* I have used the following translations: A.W. and G.R. Mair, *Callimachus, Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron. Aratus*, London 1921 and B. Acosta-Hughes, *The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*, Berkeley 2002. For passages deriving from Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days* I quote the translation by D. Hine, *Works of Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns*, Chicago 2005.

1. *Searching for a voice*

Every poet searches for a voice, and Callimachus was definitely a pioneer in the field of inventing narrators and narratees and lending them various voices.⁷ But, how exactly should the term “voice” be understood here? If construed in its narrow, narratological sense, then it denotes the narrator(s) as “heard” within a narrative.⁸ However, in the context of the present discussion, “voice” is not limited to the above definition, but broadened to include the different narrative personas and the authorial profile as reflected in the systematic evoking of previous authors or model-texts. Hesiod, Hipponax in *Iambus* 1 or even the local historian Xenomedes in the story of Acontius and Cydippe are explicitly recalled by Callimachus as co-authorial personas, whereas the voices of numerous archaic and classical poets are heard throughout his intertextually marked poetry. However, as regards the reception of Hesiod in particular, it would be a misconception to speak of the “Hesiodic voice” as a unified, homogeneous whole; one should rather consider the diverse voices as emerging from the different styles dominating each poem of the Hesiodic corpus, mainly the autobiographical/authoritative of the *Theogony* and the moralizing/gnomic of the *Works and Days*.⁹

The official opening of the *Aitia*, the so-called *Dream*, recounts how the narrator, depicted as a young poet, is transferred during a dream from his native Libya to Boeotia into the company of the Heliconian Muses (according to the testimony of an anonymous epigrammatist in *A.P.* 7.42); a poorly preserved fragment of the *Aitia*, laden with Hesiodic reminiscences, belongs—in all probability—to the context of this scene (fr. 2.1–5 Pf.):

⁷ For some excellent remarks, see Harder (2004).

⁸ On the various types of the narrative voice, depending on who narrates and on what narrative level, see Genette (1980) 212–262.

⁹ This distinction gains more importance, if considered against the background of ancient scholarship (Pfeiffer [1968] 144 and 177–178): for example, Aristotle was among the first to distinguish between genuine Hesiodic works and pseudo-Hesiodica in his treatise *Ἀπορήματα Ἡσιόδου*, whereas Apollonius of Rhodes maintained the Hesiodic origin of the *Shield of Heracles* but athetized other minor works; later on, Aristophanes of Byzantium rejected the Hesiodic authorship of the *Shield* which he ascribed to an imitator of *Iliad* 18. Moreover, Zenodotus and other scholars of Alexandria were concerned with editorial problems, such as the exact textual limits of each Hesiodic epic or the authenticity of their proems. On the Hesiodic question, see esp. Solmsen (1982); on the interconnectedness of Hesiodic poems that constituted a cycle in antiquity, see Nelson (2005) 333–335.

ποιμένι μῆλα νέμοντι παρ' ἵχινον ὄξέος ἵππου
 'Ησιόδωι Μουσέων ἑσμός ὅτ' ἠντίασεν
 μ]έν οἱ Χάεος γενεσ[
]ἐπὶ πτέρου γης ὕδα[
 τεύχων ὥς ἐτέρωι τις ἔωι κακὸν ἥπατι τεύχει

When the troupe of the Muses went to meet Hesiod, the shepherd who grazed his sheep near the trace of the swift horse ... the origin of Chaos ... by the heel ... anyone causing evil to another causes evil to himself ...

What both the archaic author of the *Theogony* (in the proem, vv. 5–35) and the Hellenistic poet share is the narration of an encounter with the Muses in a Heliconian setting. However, we may hardly assume that Callimachus went much further than this in his alleged imitation of the theogonic Hesiod.¹⁰ The Hesiodic narrator is the first author in Western literature to introduce himself by name and status—and shift from the third-person, omniscient epic narrator to a first-person voice within a couple of verses (*Th.* 22–24): αἶ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν αἰοιδήν,/ ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὑπο ζαθέοιο./ τόνδε δέ με πρόωιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον ... “such are the goddesses who taught beautiful songs once while he was shepherding lambs in the shadow of Helicon’s holy mountain, and these were the very first words they uttered to me ...”.¹¹ Callimachus cautiously avoids close imitation of Hesiod by (presumably) neglecting to mention the narrative persona by name.¹² Instead, he chooses to substitute the eutopic pseudo-realism of the *Theogony* with the literary symbolism of the *Reply to the Telchines* (fr. 1 Pf.) and the biographical fantasy of the *Dream* (fr. 2 Pf.). First of all, Callimachus documents the adventures of his poetic persona in at least two different stages of life, youth and old age (e.g. Sch. Flor. in *Ait.* 1 fr. 2.18 Pf. ἀ]ρτιγένειος ὦν ~ fr. 1.6 Pf. τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκάς οὐκ

¹⁰ For thorough analysis of this Callimachean scene, see in Kambylis (1965) 69–123. On the underlying differences between the Hesiodic and the Callimachean scene, see Pretagostini (1995).

¹¹ It goes without saying that the proem should not be considered a genuine autobiographical comment but a poetic program; the same is true of the proem’s central character, “Hesiod”, who takes the place of the implied author, see Stoddard (2004) 1–59.

¹² Callimachus exploits this Hesiodic device, i.e. the introduction by name and the shifting to first-person narrative, at the opening of *Iambus* 1: ἀκούσαθ' Ἰπλώνακτος· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἦκω ... Also written within the conventions of the funerary epigram but without including a direct reference to the author’s identity is *Ep.* 21 Pf.: ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με/ ὕθι Κυθηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην. The epigram’s closing couplet (although athetized as an interpolation) on the protection provided by the Muses has a clear Hesiodic ring (cited by the ancient Scholia in connection to Hes. *Th.* 82), and is an obvious reminiscence of the *Aitia*-prologue.

ὀλίγη),¹³ in contrast with Hesiod who throws his reader into an *in medias res* narration of a single crucial moment of his “autobiography” (*Th.* 22–23 αἶ νύ ποθ’ Ἑοίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδὴν/ ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ’).¹⁴ Secondly, he doubles the Hesiodic proem by hinting at two encounters during his youth, with Apollo (fr. 1.21–22 Pf. ὅτε πρῶτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα/ γούνασιν, Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος “when for the very first time I placed the writing-tablet upon my knees, Apollo the Lycian told me . . .”) and with the Muses (Sch. Flor. in *Ait.* 1 fr. 2.16–18 Pf. [ὥς κ]ατ’ ὄναρ σ(υ)μείξας ταῖς Μούσ[αις] ἐν Ἑλι[κῶνι] εἰλήφοι παρ’ αὐτ(ῶν) τ(ῆν) τ(ῶν) αἰτίων [ἐξήγησιν ἄ]ρτιγένειος ὢν “he recounted how during a dream he encountered the Muses in Helicon and received from them the explanations of the aitia, when still a young man with a growing beard”). And, thirdly, he creates an un-realistic textual world, inhabited by mythological entities (as the Telchines of the Prologue) and dominated by illusionary situations stemming from the re-enactment of the dialogue with the Muses as a dream.¹⁵ Thus, the bucolic scenario of the archaic epic—the implied author is presented as a shepherd who is transformed into a poet inspired by the Muses—gives way to the more sophisticated, fictional world of the *Aitia*,¹⁶ moreover, at least some of the settings implied in the *Aitia*, such as the urban backdrop to the symposium in fr. 43 Pf., juxtapose the neoteric textual reality with the one constructed in the *Theogony*.¹⁷

Apart from the setting, voice, point of view and choice of subject matter can help us detect further differences between the poet of the

¹³ The text seems to distinguish between an old “Callimachus” as the primary narrator and his younger self as a secondary narrator, see Harder (1988) 9.

¹⁴ Yet Callimachus through reference to youth and old age evokes another facet of the Hesiodic tradition, the biographical; on the proverbial expression Ἑοιόδειον γῆρας and the legendary double youth of Hesiod, see Scodel (1980). On the implied author and reader in the *Aitia*-Prologue, see Schmitz (1999) 158–165.

¹⁵ Massimilla (1996) 234–235 stresses that the presentation of the encounter as a dream radically differentiates Callimachus from Hesiod, and places him among the authors who recount visionary experiences with gods, such as the legendary Epimenides; cf. Kambylis (1965) 104–109. The framing of the scene within a dream is viewed as a tendency towards rationalization by Pretagostini (1995) 170–172.

¹⁶ On the textual reality constituted by Callimachus in the *Aitia*-Prologue, see Schmitz (1999).

¹⁷ Even in describing the archetypal Heliconian landscape, Callimachus distances himself from the *Theogony* by ingeniously remapping its geography; for an overview of the problem, see Massimilla (1996) 235–237. Differently Kambylis (1965) 110–122 who argues that Callimachus presented himself as drinking from the same spring, the Hippocrene, as Hesiod did.

Theogony and Callimachus in the *Aitia*. It is a common *topos* that the archaic *aoidos* acquires his song directly from the Muses, and their invocation is a typical device in the poetical *prooimia* from Homer on. Hesiod reverses the process by presenting the Muses as approaching the poet unbidden, interrupting his bucolic occupation and hurling insults at him (*Th.* 22–28); their subsequent passing to the offended of the laurel and presenting him with the gift of divine song verges on the absurd (*Th.* 29–34); only towards the end of the proem does the narrator adopt a hymnal closure of praise with the demand, uttered repeatedly and resolutely (*Th.* 105 κλείετε, 108 εἴπατε, 114 ἔσπετε), that the Muses start their narration—but, as already stated, *through his own voice* (e.g. *Th.* 31–34):¹⁸

ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν
θέσπιν, ἵνα κλείοιμι τὰ τ' ἐσόμενα πρὸ τ' ἐόντα,
καί μ' ἐκέλονθ' ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων,
σφᾶς δ' αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖδεν.

They inspired me with vocal, prophetic song, to enunciate matters to come and others that have been. They commanded me to sing of the race of the blessed immortals, hymning themselves at beginning and end of every poem.

In contrast with the self-aware and dynamic Hesiodic voice, the Callimachean narrator pretends ignorance. So how does the Callimachean persona document his relationship with both Apollo and the Muses within the framework of the books 1–2 of the *Aitia*? By allowing them to speak (i.e. by embedding their speeches in his narrative), Callimachus multiplies the authorial voices in the *Aitia*.¹⁹ His Apollo takes over the role of the Hesiodic Muses in giving instructions and addressing the inexperienced poet in a less contemptuous (fr. 1.21–28 Pf.) but all the same commanding tone (fr. 1.25 Pf. πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα); the poetic persona obediently follows the god's instructions for *leptotes* (fr. 1.29 Pf. τῷ πιθόμην). On the other hand, the Callimachean Muses, unlike their distanced counterparts in the *Theogony*, engage in an intimate dialogue

¹⁸ In an excellent analysis of this programmatic episode, Stoddard (2004) 60–97 goes even further in arguing that Hesiod, by stressing the unbridgeable gap between the realms of mortals and gods, emphasizes the fact that he cannot simply be considered a “mouthpiece” for the Muses; in effect, in singing a different song from the one that the Muses usually sing, he claims his independence and separation from them.

¹⁹ However, Apollo, the Muses and the young “Callimachus” are only secondary narrators, since it is the primary narrator—the aged “Callimachus”—who reports their speeches (Harder [1988] 9).

with the mortal poet.²⁰ Callimachus' innovation in creating his Muses against the background of both Homeric and Hesiodic epic lies in the fact that they are not only dramatized but that they also sing with their own voice;²¹ the dialogue as a framework for *Aitia* 1–2, during which the poet poses the questions and the goddesses answer by narrating the aitia, is clearly attested by the anonymous poet of *A.P.* 7.42.7–8: αἱ δὲ οἱ εἰρομένῳ ἄμφ' ὠγγύων ἡρώων/ Αἴτια καὶ μακάρων εἶρον ἀμειβόμεναι “and the Muses to his queries about the heroes of old and of gods gave answers in turn”. Surviving fragments of the framework of the *Aitia* are interspersed with comments upon this dramatized conversation: introduction by name, alternation of the leading narrator of each story (Clio in the aition for the Charites fr. 3–7.14 Pf. and the aition on the Sicilian cities fr. 43 Pf., Calliope in the narration on the Argonauts fr. 7.19–21 Pf.), theatrical gestures (fr. 43.56–57 Κλειώ δὲ τὸ [δ]εύτερον ἤρχ[ετο] μ[υ]θ[ο]ν/ χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἀδελφειῆς ὄμον ἐρρειαμένη “Clio began her speech for a second time, laying her hand on her sister's shoulder”)—all this suggests that Callimachus offered a lively and humanized presentation of the Muses as his co-narrators.²²

The content of this informative dialogue, i.e. the aitia, also suggests an obvious affinity with the *Theogony*.²³ The fascination with origins and beginnings is common to both works, but, while the *Theogony* tells of how the gods came into being and ends with an appendix on the birth of heroes and demi-gods, the *Aitia* explain how cult and religious practices honouring gods and heroes originated.²⁴ Investigating the mythical past (or rather the past of the myth) is of paramount importance to

²⁰ On commenting upon λέσχη (a lemma in fr. 2a.44 Pf.), Massimilla (1996) 241 suggests that it implies a conversation in confidential tone between the poet and the Muses.

²¹ Cf. Hunter (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004] 45): “the Muses now [i.e. in Callimachus in contrast with Hesiod] answered the poet's often very obscure questions, rather than withdrawing to “the background” after inspiring the poet with the gift of song.”

²² The idea that Callimachus took a “mimetic” view of the epic invocations of the Muse is suggested by Harder (1988) 6–8, who draws a parallel between the mimetic Muses of the *Aitia*, the mimetic narrator of the hymns 2, 5 and 6 and previous authors, such as Hipponax or Plato, who playfully varied epic invocations.

²³ The connection of the invocation of the Muses with aitiological information is hinted at in the *Iliad* (1.1 ff. and 16.112 ff.), but elaborated in the *Theogony*, see Harder (1988) 13.

²⁴ Hunter (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004] 54) thinks that Callimachus found the seed for his aitiologies in the episode of Prometheus where the aition of the nature of Greek sacrifices is explained (*Th.* 535–616).

Callimachean poetics, and the *Aitia* are no exception to this.²⁵ In particular, the positive outlook on the notion of progress as a development from a chaotic past towards a civilized present can also be observed in the *Aitia*—a feature which binds Callimachus more closely with at least the core ideology of the *Theogony*.²⁶ However, the arrangement of material follows quite diverse patterns in the two poems. For the *Theogony*, progression from the state of Chaos, existing ἐξ ἀρχῆς (45) and πρῶτιστα (116), to the formation of a unified cosmos and a coherent theological system is linear and follows the succession of generations. Callimachus, in his catalogue-structured *Aitia*, proceeds from one story to another rather randomly,²⁷ following his obsession with learning (e.g. fr. 43.84–85 Pf. ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ [τὸ πν]θέσθαι ἢ]θέλον—ἦ γάρ μοι θάμβος ὑπετρέφ[ετ]ο “but I also wanted to learn this in addition—because my wonder grew ...”).²⁸

As we have seen, thirst for knowledge and pretended ignorance constitute the narrator's profile in the *Aitia*; this type of narrator is quite distinct from the authoritative voice of the theogonic narrator, but, most significantly, from the didactic voice dominating the *Works and Days*, to which I will now turn my attention. Didactic poetry presupposes (in the universe of the poem, that is) the intellectual or ethical supremacy of the speaking persona over an ignorant or morally inferior narratee to whom his lecture is addressed.²⁹ In the *Works and Days*, the narrator, being himself a character of the story he narrates, addresses “Perses”,

²⁵ Nikitinski (1996) dedicates a monograph to the analysis of Callimachus' preoccupation with the past.

²⁶ But should be perhaps contrasted with the Hesiodic voice of the *Works and Days*, when it expresses e.g. a pessimistic view on the decline of mankind in the myth of the five ages (*WD* 109–201); Clay (2003) 49–80, however, argues for a unified view of the cosmos in the two poems and attributes their apparent divergence to the adoption of a divine and a human viewpoint in the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* respectively. For a positive interpretation of the development from the past to the present in the *Aitia*, see Harder (2003) 296–302.

²⁷ Harder (2003) 299 points out that a striking characteristic of the *Aitia* is that “the various periods are not presented in chronological order, but that the reader is forced to move through time in various directions, ending more or less where he began”.

²⁸ According to Hunter (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004] 54–55), Callimachus, by replacing the teleological aspect of the *Theogony* with a sequence depending on the interests of the poet-enquirer, invests his narrative with a purely human tone. On the *Aitia* as a poem of knowledge, see Hutchinson (2003).

²⁹ That the didactic poetry of Hesiod did not have any genuine instructive purpose and that “didacticism” has a purely formal sense is convincingly argued by Heath (1985).

who in the poem's scenario assumes the role of his brother, and, though only secondarily, the "kings"; both addressees remain silent while being treated with contempt as *nēpioi*.³⁰ The communicative situation has been cogently described as a "didactic drama" enacted by *dramatis personae* playing the parts of teacher and pupil respectively; in effect, the function of this poetic strategy is to thematize its reception by the implied reader and steer his response towards the authority of the narrator.³¹ A concomitant feature of this model is the use of a special type of discourse, gnomic, paraenetical and often allegorical, expressed through reference to paradigmatic myths and fables; that the *Works and Days* are grounded on these features is a fact that hardly needs documentation.

Unlike Aratus and Nicander, Callimachus never wrote a *ἐν ἄεισμα διηγεῖς* purporting to be a didactic poem. So, the question I wish to address here is whether Callimachus exploited the *WD*-voice in any of his poems and, if so, to what extent he recontextualized it to suit his own aesthetic purposes. An overt narrator addressing an individual or a group of people in a second person apostrophe is a widespread model in Callimachean poetry; the literary polemic of the *Aitia*-Prologue against the Telchines, the religious warnings given by the master of ceremonies to the faithful in the mimetic hymns, and several epigrams containing moral instruction clearly illustrate the point.³² But, as I will argue, the communicative situation created in some of Callimachus' *Iambi* in combination with specific choices as regards narrative mode, tone and content strikes the reader as being in particular a reminiscence of the *WD*-voice.

The collection of the *Iambi*, which probably constituted an autonomous poetry book, begins with the famous phrase ἀκούσαθ' Ἰππώνακτος (fr. 191.1 Pf.), introducing the iambic poet Hipponax rising from the dead to give advice to the *philologoi* of contemporary Alexandria. However, the Hipponactean persona immediately relinquishes iambic invective (fr. 191.3–4 Pf. φέρον ἱαμβον οὐ μάχην αἰείδοντα/ τὴν Βουπάλειον

³⁰ For a brief overview of narrator and narratee(s) in the *Works and Days*, see Nünlist (2004) 31–34.

³¹ This communicative model of the *Works and Days* as being adopted by Aratus in his *Phainomena* is superbly analyzed by Fakas (2001) 85–148.

³² It should be noted, though, that other genres as well served as Callimachus' models in developing this communicative situation: according to an interesting suggestion put forward by Meyer (2005) 127–258, Callimachus applied the convention of a fictional communication ("Appellstruktur") of the inscribed epigram to his epigrams, elegies and iambi.

“bearing an *iambus* which does not sing of the Bupalean battle ...”) and opts for ethical instruction; thus, instead of practicing his regular polemic, “Hipponax” presents the parable of the seven sages to the quarrelsome scholars.³³ Obviously, the speaking “I” with moralizing intent is also a commonplace of archaic iambic and admonitory verse in general;³⁴ but if *Iambus* 1, along with several other poems from the same collection, is read against the background of the *Works and Days*, then new perspectives on the interpretation of Callimachean poetics might open up.³⁵ First, the narrative situation described above as “didactic drama” seems to be the guiding principle of the entire collection, even if it is not present in each individual poem. In its opening and closure this communicative model is recontextualized to match literary polemic; thus, the narrator appears first as Hipponax in *Iambus* 1 and then in *propria persona* in *Iambus* 13, as addressing a host of argumentative scholars and literary adversaries. If Hesiod in the *Works and Days* voices the worries of his persona, sketched out as a poor peasant and farmer of Ascra, one can understand why Callimachus expresses the concerns stemming from his fictional persona as a poet involved in the aesthetic strife of contemporary Alexandria. The archaic model is also refashioned as regards the identity of its addressee; in Callimachus a class of people, the literati, corresponds to the Hesiodic *basileis*, whereas individualized addressees appear only in the non-programmatic *Iambi*. The phrase νῦν δ’ αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω φρονέουσιν καὶ αὐτοῖς “now I shall tell you a fable for kings who have understanding” (*WD* 202) not only finds an echo in the famous *Aitia*-Prologue apostrophe (fr. 1.7 Pf.) Τε[λ]χίσιον ἐγὼ τόδε “to the Telchines I have to say the following ...”, but is also heard throughout the *Iambi* from the very first precept ἀκούσαθ’ (cf. fr. 191.31 Pf. σωπὴν γενέσθω καὶ γράφεσθε τὴν ῥῆσιν “let there be silence and write down my tale”). Negative characterization is part and parcel of this type of communication: as the Hesiodic kings are reproached for their injustice and

³³ On Callimachus distancing himself from Hipponactean polemic iambs, see Konstan (1998). Fantuzzi (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004] 8) maintains that Hipponax *redivivus* eliminates only the personal aggressiveness, but retains his critical and polemical spirit; however, he also admits that a powerful Hellenistic-Roman tradition attributed the role of critic and corrector of morals to Hipponax, a feature which, in my opinion, is closely connected to the moralizing voice of the *Works and Days*.

³⁴ Fantuzzi (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004] 10).

³⁵ Acosta-Hughes (2002) 98–99 offers a “Hesiodic” reading of *Iambus* 13 and concludes with the remark that “the evocation of Hesiod in these lines of *Iambus* 13 gives a quality of legitimacy to Callimachus’ own poetic voice, and, both surprisingly and yet most effectively, to his own voice as an iambographer”.

foolishness (*WD* 38–39 βασιλῆας/ δωροφάγους, 40 νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ..., cf. 248–251), the viciousness of the *philologoi* and poets of *Iambi* 1 and 13 is depicted in graphic detail (fr. 191.26–35 Pf., fr. 203.19–22 Pf.).³⁶ In other *Iambi*, however, the communicative model is personalized and, in this respect, strongly recalls the kind of “relationship” developed between, e.g., Theognis and Cynus, Alcaeus and Pittacus and, of course, Hesiod and his brother Perses. Callimachus addresses a certain Andronicus in *Iambus* 2 (fr. 192.15 Pf. ὠνδρόνικε), one of his rivals in *Iambus* 4 (fr. 194.1 Pf. παῖ Χαριτάδεω) and a schoolteacher abusing his pupils in *Iambus* 5; a host of characters, identified by name and by their close ties to the speaking “I”, for example the ἐρώμενος Euthydemus of *Iambus* 3 or Philetadas of *Iambus* 9, constitute the members of a fantastic, yet vividly depicted, community.

This last feature is not especially Hesiodic, since it occurs frequently in archaic poetry and also in Hellenistic epigram.³⁷ But, the admonitory scenario of the *Iambi*, which I have tried to sketch out in my analysis, is particularly Hesiodic in that it dramatizes paraenetical discourse.³⁸ Framed within this communicative model, several types of allegorical stories and the morals drawn from them form a recurrent pattern that becomes dominant in the first half of Callimachus’ iambic collection. The narrator of the *Works and Days* describes these moral allegories with the words *logos* (106 εἰ δ’ ἐθέλεις, ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω “if you prefer, an alternate story I’ll summarize also well and expertly ...”) and *ainos* (202 νῦν δ’ αἶνον βασιλεῦσ’ ἐρέω “now I shall tell you a fable for kings who have understanding ...”); these include the allegory of the good and the bad Eris (11–26), the story of Prometheus (42–105), the myth of the five ages (106–201), the fable of the hawk and the nightingale (202–212) and the allegory of Dike (213–273). In the *Iambi* the terms *rhēsis* (fr. 191.31 Pf.) and *ainos* (fr. 194.6 Pf. ἄκουε δὴ τὸν αἶνον) describe this type of narrative. It would be tempting to trace exact analogies with, and variations on the different types of Hesiodic

³⁶ For the vivid description of the literati in *Iambus* 1 and literary critics in *Iambus* 13, see Acosta-Hughes (2002) 49–53 and 74–81.

³⁷ Cf. Acosta-Hughes’ (2002) 218–264 discussion of the model of ethical behaviour in *Iambi* 3 and 5.

³⁸ Even Hesiodic folk wisdom, such as the famous saying on the envy between artisans (*WD* 25–26), is reworked in *Iambus* 13 (cf. *Dieg.* IX.37–38 ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῇ σκεύη τεκταινόμενον). Acosta-Hughes (2002) 95–99 also traces the allusion of *Iambus* 13 vv. 50–51 to the love of the Muses as expressed in the poem of the *Theogony* 96–97 and the reworking of the parable of the good and bad Eris in vv. 52–53.

didactic in Callimachus, but I will limit the following comparison to just one passage from the *Iambi*, the fable about the voices of the animals that were transmitted to humans (*Iambus* 2). Despite the fact that Aesop is explicitly referred to as the model for this fable (fr. 192.15–16 Pf. ταῦτα δ' Αἴσωπος/ ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς εἶπεν) and that there is plenty of evidence for this story-pattern in the Aesopic collection,³⁹ the narrative has also a Hesiodic undertone in its setting and elaboration. The fairytale-like opening ἦν κείνος οὐνιαντός ... “it was in that time, when ...” (fr. 192.1 Pf.) that sets, albeit vaguely, the temporal frame of the narrative is typical of Hesiodic introductions: for example, the story of Pandora begins with πρὶν μὲν γὰρ ζῶεσκον ἐπὶ χθονὶ ... “formerly dwelt on earth ...” (WD 90) and the myth of the five ages with πρῶτιστα which is further specified by οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν, ὅτ' οὐρανῶ ἔμβασιλευεν “in the time of Cronos when he was reigning in heaven” (WD 109–111).⁴⁰ The primeval atmosphere, carefully created throughout the *Iambus* 2 by reference to Prometheus (fr. 192.3 Pf. ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος) and the era of Cronus (fr. 192.4 Pf. τὰπὶ Κρόνου τε καὶ ἔτι τὰ πρὸ ...), is a feature which recalls some of the most famous stories from the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.⁴¹ Direct speech must have been a vital part of the narrative, as implied by the *Diegesis* VI.24–27 κατὰ λύσιν γήρως ἐπ[ρέ]σβευσεν ὁ κύκνος πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ ἀλώπηξ τὸν Δία ἐτόλμησεν μὴ δικαίως ἄρχειν φάναι “the swan went on an embassy to the gods for the release from old age, and the fox dared to say that Zeus did not rule justly”.⁴² Due to this impious behaviour, Callimachus' *ainos* continues, Zeus deprived the animals of their ability to speak and, instead, gave this ability to men; thus, humans (according to the poem's scenario as literary adversaries of the narrator) inherited the voices of animals as diverse as dogs and asses. The situation strongly suggests the confrontation between Prometheus and Zeus in Hesiod, during which the former acts as a spokesman for human rights and the latter appears as a cruel and vengeful god.⁴³ But Callimachus incorporated this ideological conflict into an Aesopic fable,

³⁹ For an Aesopic reading of *Iambus* 2, see Acosta-Hughes (2002) 175–182.

⁴⁰ And, by contrast, is unparalleled in the Aesopic narratives, whose introductions are not temporal and whose first words indicate the character(s) involved in the fable e.g. ἀνθρωπὸς τις ..., αἰετὸς καὶ ἀλώπηξ ... etc.

⁴¹ On the locus communis of the Κρόνου βίος, not a reminiscence of Hesiod in particular, see Nikitinski (1996) 95–99.

⁴² Pfeiffer (1949) *ad* fr. 192.3 and 4 assumes that the speeches of the swan and the fox should be located in the lacuna between verse 3 and 4.

⁴³ The idea already in Reinsch-Werner (1976) 306–307.

thus humorously assigning the crucial role of Prometheus to animals, and then refashioned it within the context of literary polemic; this creative rewriting of Hesiodic myth and ideology by Callimachus becomes the focus of interest in the following sections.⁴⁴

2. Narrating myths

“Hesiodic myth” is as difficult to define as “Hesiodic voice”: to speak of Hesiod’s mythological narratives as a coherent group of stories, that is, sharing similar story-patterns, belonging to the same cycle, or simply having a geographical or temporal proximity as regards their content and origin, is quite misleading. Even though there are noteworthy duplications of myths within the Hesiodic corpus, such as the stories of Prometheus and Pandora, it is important to locate the core “myth” of each work, i.e. the narratives, which, through their particular structure, development and arrangement, reflect a more or less unified view of their poetic context.

It is widely held that the *Theogony*, in having genealogy as its guiding principle and in recording a roughly dynamic progress in time, thematizes the creation of the universe and the birth of gods, and documents their development until their final stabilization under the rule of Zeus. What strikes us as idiosyncratic in this notion of cosmos—in contrast with philosophical or even theological perceptions of the universe—is that Hesiod, in personifying natural elements as gods bound together by family ties, manages to merge cosmogony and theogony into a coherent whole and dramatize both.⁴⁵ It is this aspect of Hesiodic myth as incorporated in Callimachus’ poetry that I will try to illustrate by offering a

⁴⁴ Another striking example of Hesiodic allusion, as Pfeiffer (1949) *ad fr.* 193.1, Fantuzzi (Fantuzzi-Hunter [2004: 12]) and others have pointed out, can be traced in *Iambus* 3: with the opening phrase εἴθ’ ἦν, ἀναξ ὥπολλον, ἡνίκ’ οὐκ ἦα the narrator deplores the aesthetic and moral decline of his age by evoking *WD* 174–175 μηκέτ’ ἐπειτ’ ὄφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι/ ἀνδράσιν.

⁴⁵ As Clay (2003) 14 succinctly puts it “unlike the biblical Genesis, Hesiod’s model for the coming into being of the cosmos is not that of a purposeful creation by a designing Creator, but follows instead the procreative pattern of a human family”; she subsequently adds that this family consists of the most diverse members, “gods both present and past, but then also natural phenomena like the sun, moon, and stars as well as various monsters, and finally a host of abstractions such as Death, Strife, Peace, Festivity and Justice.”

comparative reading of the *Hymn to Zeus* and the *Hymn to Delos* against the backdrop of the *Theogony*.⁴⁶

Recounting how Zeus, the father of gods and men, was born and brought up and came to power is the myth of the *Theogony* par excellence; as has long been recognized by scholars, Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* builds on a Hesiodic subtext, but extends far beyond that.⁴⁷ First of all, in selecting the Arcadian version of the birth of Zeus, the neoteric poet casts doubt upon the tradition prevalent since Hesiod regarding the Cretan origin of the god (*Th.* 477–484), while indirectly reproaching his archaic predecessor for falsehood.⁴⁸ To the controversial question of whether Zeus was Cretan or Arcadian (4–5) the omniscient narrator answers with authoritative certainty (10): ἐν δέ σε Παρρασίῃ Ῥεῖη τέκεν “it was in Parrhasia that Rhea bore thee ...”. The setting in both poems is much the same—a distant location in the mountains (10–14~*Th.* 483–484)—, and so are the *dramatis personae*, Rhea and Gaia, but the scenario differs markedly. In the *Theogony* the narration of the birth of Zeus is placed within a highly dramatic context: Rhea, fearing that Cronus will swallow their sixth child, as he did with the first five, manages to give birth to Zeus secretly in Crete, with the advice and help of Gaia. Immediately after her labour, she hands Cronus a stone wrapped in swaddling clothes to swallow, thus saving the infant Zeus and subsequently paving the way for his ascent to power (*Th.* 453–491). Now Callimachus neglects to mention this critical situation and instead focuses his narration upon the practicalities of childbirth; it is the pressing need for water, so that mother and newborn infant can be washed, that motivates the long digression on the drought of Arcadia (15–27). With this narrative trick, Callimachus links theogony with cosmogony; Rhea's appeal to Gaia for

⁴⁶ Stephens (2003) 74–121 analyzes the “new theogonies” created in these interconnected hymns, in which mythology, contemporary history and Egyptian ideology about kingship converge.

⁴⁷ For a Hesiodic reading of the theogonic part of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, see Reinsch-Werner (1976) 24–51 and Stephens (2003) 77–108; cf. McLennan (1977) 25–90. Hunter-Fuhrer (2002) 164–175 succinctly argue that Callimachus read the *Theogony* as a “Hymn to Zeus” in the sense that telling the creation of the universe must specifically focus on the birth, the *timai* and the power of Zeus. On a “metaliterary” reading of the hymn, see Crespo (2001).

⁴⁸ The accusation of κρητίζειν “telling lies” in vv. 7–8 made indirectly against Hesiod recalls the enigmatic statement uttered by the theogonic Muses on their ability to speak truth and lies alike; cf. Reinsch-Werner (1976) 25–27 and Stephens (2003) 79–91.

help in vv. 28–32 recalls the latter’s key role in the creation of the natural elements in the *Theogony*:

“Γαῖα φίλη, τέκε καὶ σύ· τεαὶ δ’ ὠδίνες ἐλαφραί.”
 εἶπε καὶ ἀντανύσασα θεὴ μέγαν ὑψόθι πῆχυν
 πληξεν ὄρος σκήπτρῳ· τὸ δέ οἱ δίχα πουλὺ διέστη,
 ἐκ δ’ ἔχεεν μέγα χεῦμα.

“Dear Earth, give birth thou also! Thy birthpangs are light.” So spake the goddess, and lifting her great arm aloft she smote the mountain with her staff; and it was greatly rent in twain for her and poured forth a mighty flood.

The “lightness” of Gaia’s pains is a playful (indeed metatextual) allusion to the easiness of her labours in the *Theogony*, as suggested by the repetitive (ἐ)γείναιτο followed by the catalogues of her offspring in the archaic epic (*Th.* 126–153). In the Callimachean passage, however, Rhea assumes the role of the creator, as she strikes the rock with her staff and makes a torrent gush forth. On the other hand, this image, though not scientific in the strict sense of the term, captures a detail of physical geography which is totally absent from Hesiod’s theogonic discourse; what follows is a quasi-realistic description of the aftermath of childbirth, the caring, feeding and swaddling of the newborn, with the information that Zeus is at last transferred from Arcadia to Crete (32–54). Both narratives conclude with the aition of the *omphalos*, attesting to the poet’s truthfulness. To a monument left behind by Zeus himself as a reminder of his triumph over Cronus (*Th.* 498–500 τὸν μὲν [sc. λίθον] Ζεὺς στήριξε ... σῆμ’ ἔμην ἐξοπίσω, θαῦμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι “Zeus erected that stone ... set as a sign thereafter, a marvel to men, who are mortal”), Callimachus merely juxtaposes place names rumoured among the locals to recall the passage of the god from Arcadia and Crete—the Πείης λεχώιον and the Ὀμφάλιον πέδον. In documenting these local aitia, Callimachus takes a third step (after criticizing the Cretan lies and giving a pragmatic explanation of natural phenomena) towards the rationalization of Hesiod’s belief in a remote cosmos of supernatural creatures.⁴⁹

Although the second part of the hymn (55–90), an allegory of contemporary Ptolemaic politics, which narrates how Zeus gained control

⁴⁹ According to Hunter-Fuhrer (2002) 173–175, Callimachus does not articulate his own religious beliefs in emphasizing the physical details of birth nor does he aim at creating “realism”; the strategy of the poem is to juxtapose the “mythologies” of Zeus to the “realities” of his universal and omnipresent power.

over the other Olympians, is also re-portrayed on a Hesiodic canvas,⁵⁰ the point of my reading so far has been to demonstrate to what extent Callimachus distances himself from the Hesiodic myth of theogony in particular. To that end, I will now discuss another variation on this archetypal myth as reworked in the *Hymn to Delos*. Beginning with the hymn's overall design, we can see that Callimachus integrates theogonic discourse into a typical section of the hymnic genre, the *gonai* of the praised deity; but, since this hymn is dedicated to a place, the theogonic discourse inevitably develops into a cosmogonic one. In effect, however, the hymn records three "births" that intersect with one another, a cosmic (of Delos), a divine (of Apollo) and a human (of Ptolemy Philadelphus).⁵¹ If Callimachus had adopted the ordering of the *Theogony*, these births would have to follow in linear sequence one after the other; instead, he synchronizes the process on the natural and the divine level, whereas the human birth is incorporated into a proleptic speech. Therefore, unstable sites, including the moving island of Delos, only find their fixed place in cosmic order upon the birth of Apollo (51–54 ἡνίκα δ' Ἀπόλλωνι γενέθλιον οὐδας ὑπέσχεσθαι ... ἐνὶ πόντου κύμασιν Αἰγαίοιο ποδῶν ἐνεθήκαο ῥίζας "but when you gave thy soil to be birthplace of Apollo ... amid the waves of the Aegean sea did you plant the roots of thy feet").⁵² And Apollo, unborn yet, guarantees the future authority of the terrestrial monarch within a prophecy (162–190), thus stressing the interdependence of divine and political power. In addition, by juxtaposing conflicting views on the creation of the universe, Callimachus undermines the authority of Hesiod's account. The *Hymn to Delos* offers at least three different versions of how the islands came into being. Was it Water, personified as Oceanus and Tethys (17–18), or Earth, moulded into islands by Poseidon himself (30–33), the first element? Or was it perhaps the metamorphosis of a celestial nymph that created the floating island of Delos (37–38)?

⁵⁰ A thorough discussion of the second part of the hymn within the context of the Hesiodic "succession myth" but also in relation to the *Works and Days* in Reinsch-Werner (1976) 51–73 and Stephens (2003) 108–114.

⁵¹ The passage on the nymph Melia in vv. 79–85 particularly recalls Hesiodic anthropogony, since Meliai are the earthborn tree nymphs (*Th.* 563) which gave birth to the bronze race (*WD* 143–145); on this oblique reference to the origins of mankind, see Hardie (2000) 20.

⁵² For the idea that the fixation of Delos and the birth of Apollo are simultaneous events stemming from Pindar's first hymn (fr. 33d Sn.-M.), itself being a reworking of Hesiod's *Theogony*, see Hardie (2000) 26–30. On the "instability" of Asteria/Delos in the hymn, see Nishimura-Jensen (2000) 289–294.

Revision of the Hesiodic model is not limited to the invalidation of linear, progressive movement in time or to the question about the primeval elements of cosmos; major concepts pervading the *Theogony*, such as the classification of cosmic and divine entities within a genealogical scheme or the attainment of stability in the universe through violent struggles, are refashioned in the Callimachean narrative. Two genealogical instances in the hymn deserve special attention. The first is traditional in that it presents the primeval couple of Oceanus and Tethys and their island daughters gathering together (18 νῆσοι ἀολλίζονται) and walking in procession (17–22). Callimachus does not only offer a miniature of the long catalogue of the male children, the rivers of the world, and the female children, the Oceanids, of Oceanus and Tethys from the *Theogony* (*Th.* 337–370). He furthermore dramatizes a humdrum enumeration into a vivid family scene,⁵³ where the old hierarchy is no longer respected; thus little Delos, the tiniest island as compared to Corsica, Sardinia, Euboea and Cyprus, always marches at the head of the procession (18 ἀεὶ δ' ἔξαρχος ὀδεύει). The second instance is latent, and requires detailed knowledge of previous poetry, primarily of Hesiod and Pindar. In v. 150 Leto is called Κομήϊς, daughter of Coeus, and, according to Hesiodic genealogy, she is Asteria's sister (*Th.* 404–410).⁵⁴ Now both Pindar (fr. 52h Sn.-M.) and Callimachus in his hymn (37–38) emphasize the myth according to which the nymph Asteria is transformed into the island of Delos in her attempt to flee Zeus' advances. However, the significance of this personal bond is downplayed at the beginning of the hymn, when it is explicitly stated that Leto does not associate with her sister (39–40): τόφρα μὲν οὔπω τοι χρυσήν ἐπεμίσγετο Λητώ,/ τόφρα δ' ἔτ' Ἀστερίη σὺ καὶ οὐδέπω ἔκλεο Δῆλος “until then golden Leto did not consort with you: then you were still Asteria and were not yet called Delos”. It is only after her transformation into an island, i.e. after the elimination of her previous identity, that the two sisters can finally become close (200–204).

⁵³ Vv. 76–77 capture another domestic snapshot, where the father river Ismenus flies hand in hand with his two daughters torrents, Dirce and Strophia; cf. the scene in which the Thessalian nymphs supplicate their father Peneios in vv. 110–111. Also sexual relationships between the gods and their favourite places, such as between Poseidon and Helice, are hinted at in the hymn (101 ἐταίρη).

⁵⁴ However, her identification with Delos is perhaps a later invention, see West (1966) 281.

Family relations are put to the test during this pre-Apollonian era in which instability and conflict reign.⁵⁵ The episode of Peneios (105–152) illustrates this well: the river-god, in expressing his solidarity with Leto and displaying heroic resistance to Hera and other Olympians, causes a violent clash between opposing divine and cosmic forces. The episode is rewritten against the backdrop of the Hesiodic Titanomachy (*Th.* 617–719),⁵⁶ as numerous verbal reminiscences and allusions clearly demonstrate; but there are also significant divergences from the archaic text. For example, the setting is transposed to a temporal level following the completion of the Titanomachy proper. According to a metatextual comment, integrated into a simile, the banging noise of Ares' shield echoes the sound generated by Briareos as he moves beneath Aetna, a variation in turn on the theogonic passage describing the punishment imposed on the defeated Typhoeus by Zeus (*Th.* 859–861).⁵⁷ The theatre of the battle has remained much the same: in Hesiod the battlefield ranges from Olympus to Ossa (*Th.* 631–632) and in Callimachus it is located exactly between the two Thessalian mountains, in Peneios (137–140). What has changed, however, given the panoramic view dominating in the hymn, is the scale, since the god-guardians over land and sea, Ares and Iris, are placed in two boundary points of Greece, Mt. Haemus in Thrace and Mt. Mimas in Asia Minor respectively (61–67). In the Callimachean narrative, however, injustice and violence seem to lie with the side of the Olympians;⁵⁸ this is an ironic reversal of the theogonic model, where Zeus, supported by the Olympians, fights against the Titans and Typhoeus, who explicitly threaten his supremacy. After the completion of this episode, Callimachus offers the reader yet another narrative surprise: the Titanomachy is never “really” settled, but it is

⁵⁵ According to Nishimura-Jensen (2000) 313–314, the description of unstable geographies by Callimachus and Apollonius presumably reflects their lack of belief in an organized universe, views clearly contrasting the older belief in an evolution of the world from chaos to order.

⁵⁶ For a thorough discussion of the episode in Hesiod, see West (1966) 336–356. In addition, Callimachus evokes other poems which narrate the war of the gods, such as books 20–21 from the *Iliad* and perhaps the now lost *Titanomachy* of Eumelus or Arctinus; on a comparative reading of the scene with the *Theogony* and also with the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles*, see Reinsch-Werner (1976) 238–242 and Mineur (1984) 133–158.

⁵⁷ The conflation of the two distinct episodes in Callimachus is deliberate, as the use of the participle τυφομένοιο in v. 141, a wordplay with the name of Typhoeus, clearly shows; therefore, Mineur (1984) 153 observes that “the name of Briareus in the next line comes as quite a surprise.”

⁵⁸ Stephens (2003) 117 succinctly speaks of “divine malevolence” in the *Hymn to Delos*.

destined to be repeated—this time during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The attack of the Gauls against the Greeks, expressly likened to the cosmogonic event of the battle of the gods (174 ὁψίγονοι Τιτῆνες), links the primeval myth of the *Theogony* with contemporary history, by suggesting an obvious connection between Zeus and Ptolemy.⁵⁹ All in all, we observe that the theogonic myth, recontextualized within the genre of the hymn, assumes a double function: on the one hand, it broadens the scope of the traditional *gonai*-section so as to include cosmogony, by simultaneously questioning Hesiodic views on the matter; on the other hand, the underlying identification of Ptolemy Philadelphus with Zeus lends a political quality to the idea that creation is progression through struggle from a state of chaos to eternal order.

The “web of myths” which forms the core of another poem attributed to Hesiod, the *Catalogue of Women*, has also left its lasting mark on Callimachus’ poetry. But, since both the poetic œuvre of Callimachus as well as the two main collective epics of Hesiod with a mythological subject matter, the *Catalogue* and the *Great Ehoiai*,⁶⁰ are preserved in fragments, the main testimony to a direct reception of these Hesiodic poems by Callimachus is restricted to the reworking of the myth of Erysichthon (fr. 43 M.-W.) in the latter’s *Hymn to Demeter*. Nevertheless, it has been argued that the narrative structure and principal story-patterns of the *Catalogue* had a deep and sustained influence on Hellenistic poetics.⁶¹ Bearing this in mind, I will argue that Callimachus (at least partly) conceived his *Aitia* not only as a “sequel to the *Theogony*” but also as a neoteric version of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, in terms of arrangement, content and story-patterning.

One of the ways of ‘reading’ the *Aitia* is as a neoteric response to the genealogical and catalogue poetry stemming from the tradition of the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue*.⁶² From a formal perspective, the ques-

⁵⁹ See Stephens (2003) 119.

⁶⁰ It has not yet been cleared up whether these titles correspond to two different poems or to one; on this philological question, see the fundamental survey of Casanova (1979), and cf. the recent overview in Hirschberger (2004) 26–31.

⁶¹ On the Hellenistic reception of the *Catalogue of Women* in several Hellenistic poets, see Hunter (2005a); the reception of the *Catalogue* in Theocritus and Apollonius is discussed by Clauss (1990). On the Hellenistic adaptation of the Hesiodic catalogue form, see Asquith (2005).

⁶² On the *Catalogue* as a finely structured “Heroogonie”, see Hirschberger (2004) 30–31. Ancient scholars viewed the *Catalogue* as a sequel to the *Theogony*, and therefore the first couplet of the *Catalogue* was added to the end of the *Theogony*; on this editorial prob-

tions repeatedly addressed by the narrator to the Muses and introducing the various aitiological stories in books 1 and 2 recall the structure of the archaic *Catalogue*, where each new narrative is introduced with an *ehoie*.⁶³ Nevertheless, there are considerable differences with respect to the narrator's attitude: in the *Catalogue* the narrator disappears after the proem to assume the persona of the connoisseur of heroic genealogy, whereas in the *Aitia* ignorance, doubt, even irresolution prevail in the repeated questions and the ambiguous answers of the narrative frame. An outstanding example of this strategy in the *Aitia* is provided by *Scholia Florentina* (in *Ait.* 1 fr. 3–7.29–35 Pf.):

τ[αὐτὰ τε ο(ῦν) π(αρά) Κλειοῦς φησιν ἀκη[κο]μένα[ι] καὶ περὶ τ(ῆς)
[τ(ῶν)] Χαρίτ(ων) γενέσεως ὥς Διονύ[σου] ἐ[ῖ]σι καὶ Κορων[ίδος] νύμ-
φης Ναξίας, αὐτὸς προειπὼν ὥς παρ' [οἷς] μ(έν) ἰστορο(ῦν)ται Ἥρας
καὶ Διὸς [εἰν]αι, παρ' οἷς δ(έ) Ε[ὐρυν]όμης τ(ῆς) Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ
Διὸς, παρ' οἷς δ(έ) Ε[ὐάν]θη τ(ῆς) Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Διὸς

He says that he has heard these from Clio, and also of the origin of the Charites from Dionysus and the Naxian nymph Coronis, having himself said beforehand that some claim that the Charites were the children of Hera and Zeus, some of Eurynome, the daughter of Oceanus, and Zeus and some of Euanthe, the daughter of Ouranos, and Zeus.

Clio, playing the role of the omniscient narrator, gives the “correct” genealogy of the Charites from Dionysus and Coronis. In her certainty she resembles the narrator of the *Catalogue* stating repeatedly who slept with whom (reflected in the recurrent formulas γῆμε, ὑποκυσσάμενη, ὑποδμηθεῖσα, λέχος εἰσαναβάσα) and who bore whom (reflected in the recurrent formulas τέκεν/τέκετο, γείνατο, ἐξεγένοντο). Given the fact that the data of the *Catalogue* evoke a distinct past, during which gods and heroes lived together in harmony, this type of narrator claims to possess an almost superhuman authority. The novelty lies in the conflicting versions provided by Callimachus: scholarship, it is suggested, is the neoteric substitute for the god-sent authority of the archaic narrator; therefore, there is no single “truth” about stories, such as those recounting the offspring of Zeus or Dionysus and various eponymous nymphs.⁶⁴

lem, see West (1966) 437 and Hirschberger (2004) 163–164; cf. 42–51 for an overview of bibliography discussing authorship and dating of the work.

⁶³ Rutherford (2000) 93 describes the structure of the *Catalogue* as balancing between a centripetal force (the genealogy) and a centrifugal (the *ehoie* entries); is it then possible to see an analogy in the organization of the *Aitia* as a syntagmatic structure (the frame and the aitiological queries) against a paradigmatic (the aitiological narratives themselves)?

⁶⁴ A similar conflict between knowledge and religion can be traced in the famous

Apart from the differences in perspective, the choice of subject matter in the *Aitia* points towards the *Catalogue*; the fact that both works deal with the world of the heroes gives only a vague idea of the similarities between them. Taking the ancient testimonies as a point of departure, we might describe the *Catalogue* as a genealogy focused upon women (e.g. Eustath. in Hom. 1680.29 Ἡσιόδου μόνων γυναικῶν ποιησαμένου κατάλογον “Hesiod wrote a catalogue about women alone”, Max. Tyr. 26.4 p. 312 Hobein καθάπερ ὁ Ἡσίοδος, χωρὶς μὲν τὰ γένη τῶν ἡρώων, ἀπὸ γυναικῶν ἀρχόμενος καταλέγων τὰ γένη, ὅστις ἐξ ἧς ἔφυ “... as did Hesiod, who dealt with the tribes of the heroes, beginning with women as he recounted the genealogies, i.e. who was born from which woman”). However, ancient sources are not unanimous as regards the thematic emphasis of the work: was it marriage and sex (Menander *Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν* 402 πολλά δὲ αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς Καταλόγοις τῶν γυναικῶν εἴρηται περὶ θεῶν συνουσίας καὶ γάμου “Hesiod recounts much in his *Catalogues* about the couplings and the marriages of gods”), the offspring of the heroines (Archias *AP* 9.64.4 καὶ γένεος ἀρχαίων ἔγραφες ἡ(μ)ιθέων “and you wrote about the generations of the ancient demigods”), their love affairs (Max. Tyr. 18.9 p. 230 Hobein Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ ἀείδουσιν αἱ Μοῦσαι τί ἄλλο ἢ γυναικῶν ἔρωτας “what else did the Muses sing to Hesiod but the amours of women?”) or simply an encomium of feminine virtues (Luc. *Hes.* 1 ἔτι δὲ γυναικῶν ἀρετὰς) that dominated throughout the work? One testimony, though, is enlightening in that it stresses the anti-heroic character of the *Catalogue* in comparison to the Homeric epics (Dio Prus. 2.14: ὅτι ἐκείνου [sc. Ὀμήρου] περὶ τῶν ἡρώων ποιήσαντος αὐτὸς [sc. Ἡσίοδος] ἐποίησε Γυναικῶν κατάλογον, καὶ τῷ ὄντι τὴν γυναικωνίτιν ὕμνησε, παραχωρήσας Ὀμήρῳ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπαινεῖσαι “because Homer wrote about the heroes, whereas Hesiod composed a *Catalogue of Women*, and indeed he praised the harem, granting to Homer the praise of men”). In fact, this derogatory remark about the character of the *Catalogue* strongly recalls the *Aitia*-Prologue where the poetic persona defends himself against the Telchines who accuse him of not having written a long, coherent poem on heroic subjects (fr. 1.3–5 Pf. εἵνεκε]ν οὐχ ἐν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[η/.....]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἦνυσσα χιλιάσιν/ ἦ.....].ους ἦρωας “because I did not write one continuous poem on kings ... in many thousands verses ... or on

breaking-off formula from the story of Acontius and Cydippe, fr. 75.4–9 Pf., where the narrator excuses himself for not recounting the story of the incestuous marriage between Zeus and Hera.

heroes"). Callimachus is not claiming that he will not sing of heroes and of kings, since the *Aitia* deal both with stories of heroes and of kings; what he seems to be suggesting is that he will narrate stories about heroes and kings *but from an alternative perspective*.⁶⁵ It is still debated whether Callimachus included a significant number of love stories in his aitiological elegies, but his perspective upon heroic stories is comparable to that of Hesiod in the *Catalogue*—especially if we take into account the Ovidian couplet (*Rem. Am.* 381–382): *Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles, / Cydippe non est oris, Homere, tui* "Achilles is not spoken of in Callimachus's verses, sweet Cydippe is not for your mouth, Homer". There is a striking similarity between the judgement of the *Catalogue* and the *Aitia* by later writers, as in both it is their "un-Homeric" perspective that is stressed.⁶⁶

Another aspect of the *Catalogue* that is important to the reading of the *Aitia* is the setting. According to the proem of the archaic epic, what is documented in the poem is a bygone era (i.e. the fourth of the five ages of man as described in the *Works and Days*) when men and gods mingled freely at banquets and councils and had sexual relations (fr. 1 M.-W.).⁶⁷ Callimachus' depiction of this idealized past is more complex than this: on the one hand, the temporal limits of his narration are expanded so as to include events from the remote heroic past well before the Trojan War to the archaic and classical period;⁶⁸ on the other hand, the past, as viewed through the lens of aitiology and as framed within the poet's dream, appears less credible and more fairytale-like in comparison with the past as recounted in the Hesiodic epics. Closely related to the temporal setting is the guiding principle of the arrangement of the various narratives. It has been argued that the *Catalogue* was structured around the greatest family trees of Greece: it began with the prehistoric generations stemming from Deucalion and his son Hellen, while its main part focused on the genealogical presentation of the Aioliids, the Inachids,

⁶⁵ But, probably, it was not the female perspective that was emphasized in the *Aitia*, since there were numerous catalogue poems, such as Mimnermus' *Nanno* and Antimachus' *Lyde*, that most closely resembled the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, and from which Callimachus probably distanced himself; see Cameron (1995) 303–338. However, an insistence upon female figures in the *Aitia* cannot be excluded, see Hutchinson (2003) 52–55.

⁶⁶ Perhaps a key to approach this difference in perspective is what Rutherford (2000) 86 calls "lightness in tone" when discussing the presence of fantastic characters, such as Periclymenus and Iphiclus, and the depiction of pastoral and comic scenes in the *Catalogue*.

⁶⁷ See the comments by Hirschberger (2004) 163–171.

⁶⁸ The "past" in the *Aitia* is explored by Harder (2003) 296–302.

the Arcadians, the Atlantids and the Asopids.⁶⁹ The political geography of Greece during its prehistorical and early historical phase must have been of paramount importance to the understanding of this genealogical project. Did Callimachus undertake a similar project with his *Aitia*? The answer is probably affirmative for several reasons. Firstly, heroic myth in the *Aitia* is consciously refashioned to fit into a political context, with the obvious consequence that the foundation of new cities is a recurrent theme in the *Aitia*. The introductory aition on Androgeos reflects the political expansion of Minoan dominion over the Cyclades (fr. 4 Pf.); foundation of new colonies constitutes the core subject of the aition on the Argonauts (fr. 11–12 Pf.) and of the stories about the Sicilian cities (fr. 43 Pf.); eponymous heroes, like Mallos (fr. 38 Pf.), are also well attested in the work. Secondly, the division of the Greek world into tribes and races and their interdependence with local cults serves as a foil for numerous narratives in the *Aitia*. This is quite evident in the love elegies about Acontius and Cydippe, set against the background of the Ceian Tetrapolis and the Apollonian festivities of Delos, or about Phrygius and Pieria, who fell in love during the festival of Milesian Artemis at a time when Miletus and the neighbouring town of Myous were in conflict. And, last but not least, instead of selecting his material from a single mythical cycle, Callimachus offers a variegated mosaic of all Greek myth, a feature also prevalent in the *Catalogue*.⁷⁰

Even in the canonical, archaic listing of genealogies, characterized by “rapidity of narrative”,⁷¹ plenty of room seems to have been left for narrative expansions;⁷² it is noteworthy, though, that absence of direct speech and, conversely, preference for third-person narration must have been the rule in the *Catalogue*.⁷³ The first feature, catalogue-style, has left its mark on the *Aitia*, primarily in passages consisting of proper names:

⁶⁹ The genealogical scheme underlying the *Catalogue* is finely reconstructed, according to testimonies, such as Apollodorus’ *Library*, and papyrological evidence, by West (1985) 31–124 and Hirschberger (2004) 32–41.

⁷⁰ Hirschberger (2004) 63 describes the *Catalogue* as a universal history of Greek myth in epic verse; cf. Hunter (2005b) 252 who views the *Catalogue* as “a giant system of cross-referencing to archaic epic” and as “a source book of narratives waiting to be written.”

⁷¹ For the term, see Rutherford (2000) 85.

⁷² See e.g. how West (1985) 3 remarks on these narrative digressions: “As in the *Theogony*, the genealogies were interspersed with many narrative episodes and annotations of greater or lesser extent. We can see that these narratives were often very summary; but they are there, and are an essential ingredient in the poem.” For some conspicuous examples, see Rutherford (2000) 82.

⁷³ Rutherford (2000) 87–88.

the geography and foundation stories of the Sicilian cities (fr. 43.24–53 Pf.) and the archaeology of Ceos (fr. 75.56–74 Pf.) are prominent examples of catalogue-style narration, except for the formulaic expression. But it is the narrative pauses that Callimachus mostly exploits; in the above cited examples, the catalogue serves as a foil for the main narrative, i.e. the aition of Zancle (fr. 43.58–83 Pf.) and the love elegy of Acontius and Cydippe respectively. In these narratives, as in the Hesiodic catalogue epics, the characters are only rarely allowed to deliver their own speeches—a notable exception is the (alleged) soliloquy of Acontius (fr. 73–74 Pf.).⁷⁴ Instead, what we hear in the *Aitia* is the direct speech of the Callimachean narrator constantly addressing his characters with second-person apostrophes, interrogations and exhortations (e.g. in the same elegy fr. 75.44 Pf. οὐ σε δοκέω τημοῦτος, Ἀκόντιε ..., fr. 75.53 Pf. Κεῖε, τὸν δ' ἡμεῖς ἴμερον ἐκλύομεν ...), a feature totally absent from the impersonal narrative voice of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*.

Apart from the shared narrative strategies, a comparative reading of the *Catalogue* and the *Aitia* reveals the thematic affinities between the narratives included in them. For example, a key theme in the archaic *Catalogue* is that concerning either marriage or love and its implications.⁷⁵ Even though Callimachus does not thematize the unions between gods and mortals, it has been aptly pointed out that the influential love elegy of Acontius and Cydippe strongly recalls the “romantic” Atalanta story from the *Catalogue* (fr. 72–76 M.-W.),⁷⁶ whereas both this elegy as well as the one which narrates the story of Phrygius and Pieria end with happy marriages. Even traditional customs related to marriage are amply attested, such as the wedding gifts offered to Cydippe’s parents (fr. 67.9–10 Pf.) or the practice of the προνύμφιος ὕπνος performed the night before the wedding (fr. 75.1–3 Pf.). Another tale, the chasing of the Harpies by the Boreads (fr. 150 M.-W.), develops into a narrative of wanderings to the ends of the earth. The motif of pursuit set against the background of mythical and historical geography is a theme attested at least twice

⁷⁴ There is a certain irony underlying this direct speech, delivered in an unusual communicative situation, during which Acontius’ only addressees are the trees; on the humorous treatment of Acontius’ linguistic skills, see Hutchinson (2003) 52 and n. 15. It is a pity that we do not know whether the key speech of the elegy, the inscription on the apple read aloud by Cydippe, was directly delivered by Cydippe herself or by the narrator; on Callimachus’ insistent reference to orality, see Bruss (2004).

⁷⁵ On this motif, see Hirschberger (2004) 72–79.

⁷⁶ Hunter (2005b) 253 and n. 50 detects a similar story-pattern in both narratives, according to which the gods of love help a man to gain the woman he loves by tricking her with an apple.

in the *Aitia*, namely in the narration of the return of the Argonauts and the wanderings of the Colchians in the Adriatic (fr. 7–21 Pf.) and in the description of the itinerary of the gifts sent by the Hyperboreans to Delos (fr. 186 Pf.). An aitiological perspective dominated in several Hesiodic narrations, e.g. in the explanation of the name *Ileus* from ἰλεως (fr. 235 M.-W.) or of the river name *Parthenius* from παρθένος (fr. 339 M.-W.) and of the island name *Strophades* from the “turning back, returning” of the Boreads (fr. 156 M.-W.). Another point which is worthy of special attention is the “crime and punishment” motif: mortals questioning the status of the gods or unconsciously committing hubris, such as Ceyx and Alcyone, the Aloids, Niobe, Proitos, Salmoneus, are essential to the mythography of the *Catalogue*.⁷⁷ Aitiological stories, concluding with the establishment of a new cult, custom or sacrifice that functions as a means of purification after a crime against the gods and the community, also abound in the *Aitia*.⁷⁸ Two of these stories may be closely linked to the *Catalogue*: the aition on the boastful hunter (fr. 96 Pf.) and the story of the adulteress Leimonis (fr. 94–95 Pf.). The hunter who, after having insulted Artemis, is punished by the goddess and Leimonis torn apart by a savage horse are two stories recalling the myth of the hunter Actaion, whom Artemis transformed into a deer torn apart by his own dogs, probably recounted in the *Catalogue* (fr. 103 and 39* Hirschberger). Divine punishment lies at the core of some of Hesiod’s famous myths and it is to this issue that I will now turn.

3. Challenging ideals

Hesiodic gods are prompt to punish in order to uphold justice and establish moral standards; Zeus, aided by Strength (Κράτος) and Violence (Βίη), holds a special position among them, due to his ability to prevail against hubris and injustice and thus safely lead the universe from chaos to order. In contrast with this well-balanced system of divine power, Callimachus’ pantheon consists of avenging deities, eager to impose extreme, violent penalties on the weak and innocent. An outstanding example of this is the portrayal of Hera in the *Hymn to Delos*, beginning with οὐδ’ Ἥραν κοτέουσας ὑπέτρεις ... “and you did not tremble before the anger of Hera ...” (55). Probably a reminiscence of a verse from

⁷⁷ Hirschberger (2004) 79–80.

⁷⁸ Several examples are pointed out by Harder (2003) 301.

the *Theogony*, recording how Hera nourished the Lernaian Hydra out of hatred for Heracles (*Th.* 315 ἄπλητον κοτέουσα βίη Ἡρακλεΐη), the goddess' anger against Leto is a borderline case of divine injustice. A little later in the same hymn Apollo overreacts in threatening Thebes with bloodshed for offering shelter to Niobe (95–97): ταχινός σε κιχήσομαι αἵματι λούσων/ τόξον ἐμόν· σὺ δὲ τέκνα κακογλώσσοιο γυναικός/ ἔλλαχες “swiftly shall I overtake thee and wash my bow in blood. Thou hast in thy keeping the children of a slanderous woman”. But these gods are colourful, lively figures, more akin to literary heroes than to religious symbols.⁷⁹ So, by recontextualizing the Olympians into his poetic universe, Callimachus deconstructs the Hesiodic image of the stern yet fair god in two of his hymns, the *Bath of Pallas* and the *Hymn to Demeter*.⁸⁰

To comprehend how Callimachus enters into an intertextual (and ideological) dialogue with Hesiod in the *Bath of Pallas*, one has to read some of its main aspects—the profile of Athena, the setting, the encounter between the goddess and Tiresias, and its aftermath—in the light of the *Theogony*. The frame of the hymn centres around the ritual washing of Athena's statue; the staging of this activity recalls the moment when Athena withdraws from the battlefield of the Gigantomachy with her horses (7–8): οὐδ' ὅκα δὴ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένα πάντα φέροισα/ τεύχεα τῶν ἀδίκων ἦνθ' ἀπὸ γαγενέων “not even when, her armour all defiled with filth, she returned from the battle of the lawless Giants”. Whether or not Callimachus belonged to those writers who confused the Gigantomachy with the Titanomachy,⁸¹ the snapshot of Athena withdrawing from a theomachy against the forces of injustice evokes the setting of the battle of the Olympians with the Titans from the *Theogony* (*Th.* 617–719).⁸² The use of the noun ῥαθάμυγγας (11) alludes to another theogonic passage, recording the birth of the Erinyes and the Giants from the

⁷⁹ On the divinity in Callimachus as a poetic construction, only indirectly related to an autonomous theology, see Henrichs (1993); for bibliography on Callimachus' attitude towards religion, see *ib.* p. 127 n. 1.

⁸⁰ These two hymns, considered by scholars as a pair, examine the relationship between god and man: according to Heyworth (2004) 153–157, their myths present two typical modes for man to anger the gods, *inadvertently* in the case of Tiresias and *with hubris* in the case of Erysichthon, and thus reflect two classical tragedies dealing with the same subject, Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* and Euripides' *Bacchae* respectively.

⁸¹ According to West (1966) 337–338 this confusion might be observed in later literature, whereas in the archaic period the two battles are clearly distinguished.

⁸² Although it should be noted that Athena's victory over the Giants was reflected in the cult of the goddess in the Panathenaea and elsewhere, and also recorded in literature, e.g. Eur. *Ion* 987–991; on this topic, see Bulloch (1985) 118.

blood (ῥαθάμιγγες αἵματόεσσαι “bloody drops”) of the castrated Uranus (*Th.* 183–185).⁸³ But, Callimachus’ Athena abandons the slaughtering of the Giants, thereby repudiating her warrior identity, and instead embarks upon an un-epic activity, the cleansing of her horses and armour followed by the washing and beautifying herself (5–32). The eutopic springs of Oceanus (10 λυσαμένα παγαῖς ἔκλυσεν Ὠκεανῶ “she loosed from the care her horses’ necks, and in the springs of Oceanus washed ...”) further stress her distancing from the turmoil of war, whereas during the Hesiodic Titanomachy even Oceanus is forced to suffer the global consequences of the battle (*Th.* 695 ἔξεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα “all of the land boiled over as well as the waters of Ocean”). Thus, Callimachus’ Athena, isolated in her private eutopia, is too self-absorbed and narcissistic to engage in the common Olympian cause against evil.

This image of Athena is further elaborated in the mythological section of the hymn. The goddess, along with her constant companion, the nymph Chariclo, wanders in the eutopic landscape of Helicon (60–67); the spring of Hippocrene forms the ideal setting for the goddess and the nymph to go for a bathe (70–72):

δή ποκα γὰρ πέπλων λυσαμένα περόνας
ἵππῳ ἐπὶ κρᾶνᾳ Ἑλικωνίδι καλὰ ῥεοῖσα
λῶντο· μεσαμβρινὰ δ’ εἶχ’ ὄρος ἄσυχία.

One day those twain undid the buckles of their robes beside the fair-flowing Fountain of the Horse on Helicon and bathed; and noontide quiet held all the hill.

The Callimachean Athena re-enacts the opening scene of the *Theogony*, where the Muses bathe in the springs of Helicon (*Th.* 5–6): καὶ τε λοεσσάμεναι τέρενα χροῖα Περμησσοῖο/ ἢ Ἴππου κρήνης ἢ Ὀλμειοῦ ζαθέοιο “bathing their delicate skin in the spring of Permessus or in the Spring of the horse or of sacred Olmeius”. In this setting an encounter between the divine and the human is about to take place with unforeseen consequences. In the *Theogony* the Muses meet the shepherd Hesiod and present him with divine song; in granting him a sceptre made of laurel and the ability to sing both the past and the future, they proclaim him a poet endowed with prophetic powers (*Th.* 22–34).⁸⁴ By contrast, the idyllic landscape in the *Bath of Pallas*, dominated by the threatening midday

⁸³ Reinsch-Werner (1976) 94–99.

⁸⁴ See West (1966) 166.

stillness (ἄσυχία),⁸⁵ will soon become the scene of a tragic incident, highlighting the divide between the world of gods and that of men.⁸⁶

Tiresias' involuntary intrusion into the realm of gods is caused by his pressing need for water (75–78). The scene of his appearance ominously foreshadows the severe penalty he will suffer: the young man, accompanied only by his dogs (75 μῶνος ἁμᾶ κυσίν), recalls the hunter Actaion, who was torn apart by his dogs for watching Artemis as she bathed; and the narratological comment in v. 78 σχέτλιος· οὐκ ἐθέλων δ' εἶδε τὰ μὴ θεμιτὰ “wretched man! and unwillingly saw that which is not lawful to be seen ...” anticipates the decision of the goddess to strike Tiresias blind without delay.⁸⁷ The mother of Tiresias, the nymph Chariclo, protests vigorously against Athena's cruelty and expressly questions her morality (e.g. 86 τοιαῦται, δαίμονες, ἐστὲ φίλαι; “is such the friendship of you goddesses?”); Helicon is at once reduced from a Garden of Eden to a place of grief and suffering for Chariclo (90–92). In her response, Athena invokes the laws of Cronus in justification of the rigidity of Tiresias' punishment (100–102):

Κρόνιοι δ' ὧδε λέγοντι νόμοι·
ὅς κε τιν' ἀθανάτων, ὅκα μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἔλῃται,
ἄθρησῃ, μισθῷ τοῦτον ἰδεῖν μεγάλῳ.

But the laws of Cronus order thus: Whosoever shall behold any of the immortals, when the god himself chooses not, at a heavy price shall he behold.

Callimachus seems to be challenging the Golden Age ideal, according to which justice and peace governed the life of men during the era of Cronus, as primarily described by Hesiod with regard to the golden race of men (*WD* 109–126);⁸⁸ he also questions the utopian community of

⁸⁵ On the creation of a menacing atmosphere with a minimum of action and the critical time of noon, see Bulloch (1985) 177–180.

⁸⁶ Reinsch-Werner (1976) 100–102 is justified in suggesting that Callimachus chooses Helicon as a setting to highlight the old unity of poet and prophet, exemplified by Hesiod, since Tiresias receives in return for his lost sight the gift of prophecy from Athena. But, there is, I think, tragic irony in the fact that Tiresias is granted the “privilege” to foresee the doom of Oedipus (cf. 125–126 πολλὰ δὲ Βοιωτοῖσι θεοπρόπα, πολλὰ δὲ Κάδμω/χρησέι, καὶ μεγάλοις ὕστερα Λαβδακίδαις).

⁸⁷ On commenting upon the apostrophe of v. 80 τίς σε, τὸν ὀφθαλμῶς οὐκέτ' ἀποισόμενον ..., Bulloch (1985) 188 remarks: “Athena is abrupt and coldly precise, speaking as if Tiresias' eyes are a separable possession, like his tunic or sandals; she goes straight into Tiresias' punishment, with not a word of explicit pity or sympathy.”

⁸⁸ The carefree way of living in the age of Cronus is also portrayed by Plato in *Rep.* 271c–272d and *Leg.* 713a–714a.

men and gods portrayed in the proem of the *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 1 M.-W.). The key to the understanding of the alienation between men and gods lies within the changed identity of Athena: no longer the natural ally of Zeus in the war against hubris and injustice, Athena is portrayed as a beautiful yet dangerous woman. Callimachus' Athena falls into the category of the "femme fatale", best exemplified by Hesiod's Pandora; the emphasis on her sexuality as well as her vicious form—ironically—the core of the goddess' aretalogy (53–54): ὅς κεν ἴδῃ γυμνὰν τὰν Παλλάδα τὰν πολιοῦχον,/ τῶργος ἐσοψεῖται τοῦτο πανυστάτιον "whoever shall behold Pallas, keeper of cities, naked, shall look on Argos for this the last time".

The *Hymn to Demeter*, in which Callimachus exploits the "crime and punishment" motif from a different perspective, is also painted on a Hesiodic canvas; but, in contrast with the religious background and the tragic undertones of the *Bath of Pallas*, here human crime and divine punishment result in social comedy.⁸⁹ In his sixth hymn, Callimachus addresses the main ideological issues raised in the *Works and Days*. According to this Hesiodic epic, work in order to be able to sustain ourselves and evil in human life are the concomitant sufferings of the confrontation between Prometheus and Zeus (*WD* 42–105), whereas the opposing tableaux of the just and unjust city (*WD* 225–247) are markedly distinguished by prosperity and lack of food respectively;⁹⁰ thus, the hardships of everyday life are attributed to a crisis of ethical values and, conversely, affluence is regarded as a gift from the gods to the virtuous and the righteous. This is more or less the scenario of Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*, in whose aretalogical section the goddess is praised for introducing agriculture, and, hence, law into the cities of men (18 πολίεσσιν ἐαδότα τέθιμα δῶκε "she gave cities pleasing ordinances"), and for teaching the art of threshing and ploughing to Triptolemus (19–21). After the positive description of the gifts bestowed upon mankind, the narrator steers the reader's attention towards the dark side of Demeter with the caution ἵνα καὶ τις ὑπερβασίας ἀλέηται "a warning to men that they avoid

⁸⁹ The comic dimension of the sixth hymn is emphasized by McKay (1962). Although Hopkinson (1984) 13–17 stresses the thematic correspondences between hymns 5 and 6, he eventually acknowledges that "the story of Tiresias is "tragic" and pathetic, while that of Erysichthon has a more complex tone uniting wit, humour, grotesquerie, etc., as well as pathos" (p. 17).

⁹⁰ Clay (2003) 37–41.

transgression" (22), a clear echo of the closing phrase from the *Works and Days* (828 ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων).

With this Hesiodic warning leading into the narrative section of the hymn, the story of Erysichthon—also of Hesiodic provenance—begins to unfold.⁹¹ The story is set in an era preceding the foundation of the Dorian Hexapolis, when the Pelasgians still dwelt around the fruitful plain of Dotion in Thessaly (24). Demeter granted peace and prosperity to the locals and they, in exchange, created a fair grove for her (25). In describing the ἱερὸν ἄλσος of the goddess as a *locus amoenus* (25–30), the narrator places the myth of Erysichthon into a Golden Age context;⁹² within this context, the felling of the woods is a symbolic act which not only marks the end of the harmonious coexistence of men and gods, but, furthermore, the transition from primitive communities to more complex social structures. The arrogant behaviour of Erysichthon is motivated by an evil demon, ill-disposed towards the house of Triopas, which drives him to make the worst possible decision against Demeter (32): ἁ χείρων Ἐρυσίχθονος ἄψατο βωλά "the worse counsel took hold of Erysichthon". By once more evoking the moralizing discourse from the *Works and Days* (WD 266 ἡ δὲ κακὴ βουλὴ τῷ βουλευέσσαντι κακίστη "evil planning harms the planner most"), Callimachus stresses the Hesiodic subtext of his narrative: as I will argue, it is the fundamental antithesis, stemming from the *Works and Days*, between the moral integrity of the man of labour and the ethical corruption of the "New Man" that is projected upon his version of the myth of Erysichthon.⁹³

Erysichthon followed by twenty servants, strong, gigantic in size and shameless in character,⁹⁴ all armed with axes and hoes, makes his way

⁹¹ Erysichthon, mentioned by his alternative name *Aithon*, is the father of Mestra, one of the heroines of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 43 M.-W.); on the myth in Hesiod, see Hirschberger (2004) 270–285; on the literary evidence of the myth in comparison to Callimachus' version, see McKay (1962) 5–60 and Hopkinson (1984) 18–26.

⁹² As Hopkinson (1984) 102–103 rightly points out, Demeter's ἄλσος is an entirely literary creation, deriving from previous *loci amoeni*, such as Calypso's cave and Alcinoos' gardens.

⁹³ Edwards (2004) in his monograph on Hesiod's Ascrea investigates how the *Works and Days* praise the archaic, agricultural village in contrast with the emerging Greek polis on a social, economic and moral basis. For example, in chapter 6 he argues that the didactic purpose of the poem is not to teach Perses the craft of farming but to give him a moral lesson within the confines of the small, autonomous community, since (p. 178) according to Hesiod "the village is founded upon the values of justice, labor, and plenty while the city, with its *agorē* and kings, embodies those of *hubris*, indolence, and ill-gotten wealth"—a situation quite similar to that created in Callimachus' narrative of Erysichthon.

⁹⁴ The adjective ἀναιδής used to describe Erysichthon and his companions, which

towards Demeter's idyllic grove (33–36); the young prince sets out to attack a huge poplar, frequented by the nymphs at noon, the goddess' most cherished possession (37–41). Although warned by Demeter herself disguised as the priestess Nicippe (42–49), Erysichthon, likened to a wild lioness from Mt. Tmaros (50–52), furiously declares his intention to build a banqueting-hall from the sacred trees (54–55):

ταῦτα δ' ἔμὸν θησεῖ στεγανὸν δόμον, ὃ ἔνι δαίτας
αἰὲν ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισιν ἄδην θυμαρέας ἄξω.

These trees shall make my tight dwelling wherein evermore I shall hold
pleasing banquets enough for my companions.

His desire for a carefree, “urbanized” way of life, spent having banquets with good friends, is humorously juxtaposed with his vulgar manners and his rustic occupations; this would-be bourgeois encounters only one, yet formidable, obstacle to his ambitious project, the goddess of agriculture. Depicted as Eris, who has her feet on earth and whose head touches the sky (58 ἴθματα μὲν χέρσω, κεφαλὰ δέ οἱ ἄψατ' Ὀλύμπω),⁹⁵ Demeter imposes a cruel punishment upon the young hero—insatiable hunger (66–67):

αὐτίκα οἱ χαλεπὸν τε καὶ ἄγριον ἔμβαλε λιμὸν
αἴθωνα κρατερὸν, μέγала δ' ἐστρέφετο νόσῳ

Straightway she sent on him a cruel and evil hunger—a burning hunger
and a strong one—and he was tormented by a grievous disease.

The idea that hunger befalls those hostile to Demeter—and by metonymy those who do not farm the land—forms the basis of Hesiod's code of ethics (e.g. *WD* 299–300); on the other hand, the metaphor of hunger as a serious disease alludes to the portrayal of νοῦσος ἀργαλέος as the quintessence of the misfortunes caused to mankind by the opening of Pandora's jar (*WD* 90–105).

By recounting Erysichthon's reckless deed and its aftermath in these terms, Callimachus detaches the ideology of the *Works and Days* from

is repeated twice in this scene (in vv. 36 and 45), echoes (the lack of) the fundamental Hesiodic value dominating in the *Works and Days*, namely shame (αἰδώς, e.g. *WD* 317–319).

⁹⁵ The image is reminiscent of the description of Eris in *Il.* 4.443 οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει. Nevertheless, the vivid illustration of Demeter owes much to the impressive personifications of natural qualities and abstract concepts in Hesiod. It is no coincidence that Callimachus introduces the figure of Nemesis (56 Νέμεσις δὲ κακὰν ἐγρόψατο φωνάν), who appears in both the *Theogony* (223) and the *Works and Days* (200) in the same context.

its moralizing context and incorporates it into a black comedy involving the gods, the community, the family and the sinner himself. Along with Demeter, Dionysus too grows angry with Erysichthon and, therefore, imposes an additional penalty upon him, eternal thirst (69–71). Thus punished, Erysichthon is forced into social isolation to his parents' shame (73 αἰδούμενοι γονέες): on each occasion which offers the opportunity for feasting within the broader community, be it a religious festival, an athletic contest or a wedding, the mother makes pathetic excuses for his absence (72–86).⁹⁶ Ironically enough the excuses—pursuing repayment of a debt of hundred oxen, being wounded by a wild boar in Pinus, falling of his horse or counting flocks at Othrys—underline the rustic profile of Erysichthon, which further alienates him from the local aristocracy—and his bourgeois vision. Now Erysichthon's hubris wreaks havoc on the *oikos*: mother and sisters are in mourning (94–95), Triopas loses his respect for Poseidon (98–99), the father-son relation is put to the test (100–101) and hunger is regarded as a degenerative disease in the house (101–104); first and foremost, though, the family's finances are seriously threatened, as Erysichthon dissipates the household goods, money, supplies and cattle, the valuable *biotos* of the house of Triopas (105–110).⁹⁷ The calamity reaches its climax, when Erysichthon goes around begging for food (114–115):

καὶ τόχ' ὁ τῷ βασιλῆος ἐνὶ τριόδοισι καθῆστο
αἰτίζων ἀκόλως τε καὶ ἔκβολα λύματα δαιτὸς

Then the king's son sat at the crossroads, begging for crusts and the cast out remnants of the feast.

This final action renders him both hateful to gods and a bad neighbour to other people (116–117). The passage again resonates with the Hesiodic lecture addressed to Perses on the necessity of farming: work is a gift from the gods and the only alternative to it, which Perses should not follow, is begging the neighbours for food (*WD* 397–404).

Like Perses, the prodigal brother in the *Works and Days*, Callimachus' Erysichthon embodies the inclination towards idleness, injustice and impiety; *limos*, *nosos*, divine punishment, social isolation and economic catastrophe await him and his family in return. Yet, in his futile attempt

⁹⁶ Hopkinson (1984) 16–17 stresses Callimachus' preoccupation with the "modernity" of human reaction and the "civilized" semi-urban setting (weddings, games, family ties) in the story of Erysichthon.

⁹⁷ The household of Triopas is modelled on the typical Ascran *oikos*, a self-sufficient unit based on productivity and storage of goods, see Edwards (2004) 83–89.

to liberate himself from his rustic environment and in his failure to enjoy an alternative way of life, Erysichthon, though young, foolish and frivolous, eventually gains our sympathy: in the light of his tragicomedy, Callimachus looks upon the primitive obsession with agriculture and the *passé* image of the avenging god as reflected in Hesiod's poetry with a sardonic smile.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ By highlighting the complexities of modern life in the story of Erysichthon, Callimachus distances himself from the poetry of the "einfache Leute" as introduced by Hesiod's *Works and Days*; on this poetry as a distinct genre, see Fakas (2001) 100–103.

HESIOD'S STYLE: TOWARDS AN ANCIENT ANALYSIS

RICHARD HUNTER

I

Perhaps the best known of the few stylistic observations about Hesiod which survive from antiquity is Quintilian's judgement:¹

raro adsurgit Hesiodus magnaue pars eius in nominibus est occupata, tamen utiles circa praecepta sententiae, leuitasque uerborum et compositionis probabilis, daturque ei palma in illo medio genere dicendi.

Hesiod only rarely rises to the heights and a great part of his work is taken up by names; nevertheless, his gnomic maxims are useful and the smoothness of his diction and word-arrangement is convincing. He wins the palm in the middle style.

Quintilian 10.1.52 = Hesiod T 66 Jacoby, 125 Most

For Quintilian, then, Hesiod is the principal poetic example of the middle style,² which is later briefly described in the tenth chapter of Book 12: the middle style is also called *floridum* or ἀνθηρόν (12.10.58), its purpose is *delectare* or *conciliare*, its principal characteristic *lenitas* (12.10.59), it freely accommodates metaphors and figures, and its effect is as soothing as a *locus amoenus*:³

medius hic modus et tralationibus crebrior et figuris erit iucundior, egressionibus amoenus, compositione aptus, sententiis dulcis, lenior tamquam amnis et lucidus quidem sed uirentibus utrimque ripis inumbratus.

This middle manner is richer in metaphors and made more pleasing by figures; it is made lovely by digressions, has a well-structured composition and the sweetness of *sententiae*; it is like a gentle river which is translucent but shaded on both sides by verdant river-banks. Quintilian 12.10.60

¹ The present paper may be seen as an expansion and justification and, in one particular, a revision of Hunter (2006a) 128 n. 34 and (2006b) 20. I am grateful to Helen Van Noorden for her helpful criticism of an earlier version.

² Virgil's *Georgics* were also assigned to this style, cf. Jocelyn (1979) 73.

³ For such stylistic descriptions cf. Hunter (1997) 23–26.

The Homeric model for this style is Nestor—"from Nestor's mouth Homer said flowed forth a speech sweeter than honey and no pleasure greater than this can be imagined" (12.10.64)—and Quintilian's Homeric paradigm is a commonplace of ancient rhetorical writing.⁴ The allusion is, of course, to *Iliad* 1.247–249:

τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ
ἦδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε, λιγύς Πυλίων ἀγορητής,
τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή.

Nestor sweet of speech rose up, the clear-voiced orator of the Pylians; from his tongue flowed a voice sweeter than honey. Homer, *Iliad* 1.247–249

The scholia here note that Nestor's style is *προσηνὲς καὶ καταστέλλειν ὀργὴν δυνάμενον* "soothing and able to calm anger", whereas *αὐστηρὸς* speech "stirs up anger"; here precisely is Quintilian's distinction, and that of the rhetorical tradition in general, between the soothing "middle" style and the "grand" style which rouses emotion. If Hesiod "only rarely rises to the heights", this is in explicit contrast to Homer (cf. Quintilian 10.1.46–51), and it is this contrast which, as we shall see, was the most important element in ancient views of Hesiod's style.

As the principal characteristics of the "middle" style include *suavitas* and τὸ ἡδύ and τὸ γλυκύ,⁵ it is unsurprising that it maps in good part on to what in the rather idiosyncratic scheme of Dionysius of Halicarnassus is called the *γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις*, the "smooth style", to which is opposed the *αὐστηρά*, the "austere", with a middle or mixed (*εὐκρατος*) style, as evidenced by Homer, holding the privileged centre-ground; for Dionysius, Hesiod is the hexameter model of the *γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις*, where he keeps company with such as Sappho, Anacreon and Euripides. The hallmarks of this style include a lively and purposeful flow of words, which are "smooth and soft and maidenly" (*De comp. verb.* 23.2–4, cf. *Demos-thenes* 40.1), "delicate and winning figures" (*De comp. verb.* 23.7) which avoid the heaviness of archaism, and the blending of all parts into a single harmonious whole. Dionysius' judgement of Hesiod in his work *On imitation* was entirely in keeping with this, at least to judge by the abbreviated report in the extant *Epitome*.⁶

⁴ Cf., e.g., [Plutarch], *De Homero* 172 (with Hillgruber ad loc.), Radermacher (1951) 6–9, Kennedy (1957) 26–27.

⁵ Cf., e.g., Cicero, *Brutus* 40, *Orator* 91–92.

⁶ Cf. Tavernini (1953) 22.

Ἡσίοδος μὲν γὰρ ἐφρόντισεν ἡδονῆς καὶ ὀνομάτων λειότητος καὶ συνθέσεως ἑμμελοῦς.

Hesiod was concerned with pleasantness, the smoothness of words⁷ and a harmonious composition.

Dionysius Hal. *De imitatione* fr. 2.2 Aujac = Hesiod T 64 Jacoby, 124b Most

The move from ancient analyses of style to modern ones is never straightforward, partly because of the fluidity and instability of ancient categorisations,⁸ and partly because of our ignorance of the presuppositions underlying many of them. It is, for example, easy enough for us to see that the fact that the middle style is *sententiis dulcis* (Quint. 12.10.60, cf. 10.1.52 cited above) is appropriate for Hesiod, as proverbs and semi-proverbial sayings are a very marked feature of the *Works and Days* (cf. further below). It is, I think, less easy to appreciate Hesiod's "smoothness" and "harmonious composition". A search for the origins of this classification may, however, start with the accepted Homeric model for this style, Nestor. In the Iliadic verses quoted above, Nestor's speech is ἡδύ, λιγύ, "sweeter than honey", and it flows, as do both the "middle style" of Cicero and Quintilian and the γλαφυρά σύνθεσις, "smooth style", of Dionysius; the principal aim of Dionysius' "smooth style" is indeed to produce a unified λέξις which is ἡδεῖα καὶ λιγυρά "pleasant and clear" (*Demosthenes* 40.6). Hesiod himself invokes the Muses as ἡδυέπειαι in the opening verse of the *Catalogue* and elsewhere (fr. 1.1 M–W, *Th.* 965, 1021), a description which is not found in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, "from their mouths flows untiring, sweet speech", (*Th.* 39–40),⁹ and he characterises his own song as λιγυρή (*WD* 659) and καλή (*Th.* 22); any ancient, rhetorically-minded reader would have seen here specific stylistic claims about the nature of Hesiod's poetry, not merely a vague advertisement of quality.¹⁰ Moreover, the description of Nestor from *Iliad* 1 has two close Hesiodic parallels, which occur in the famous passage of the *Theogony* on kings and poets:

⁷ West (1966) 73 n. 1 seems to understand ὀνομάτων here as "names", but the parallel passages from Dionysius and elsewhere tell against this interpretation; Quintilian (10.1.52), however, perhaps understood Dionysius, or their common source, as West does. Some editors adopt Usener's δι' ὀνομάτων for the transmitted καὶ ὀνομάτων; this may be right, but it is difficult to have confidence in the stylistics of the *Epitome*.

⁸ There is helpful guidance in Russell (1964) xxxiv–xxxvii.

⁹ For the interpretative difficulty in these verses, cf. West *ad loc.*

¹⁰ It may not be irrelevant that Hermogenes uses Socrates' invocation at Plato, *Phaedrus* 237a7 to the Muses as λίγεια as an example of epithets producing "sweetness" of style (p. 338.20–21 Rabe); cf. further below p. 262.

ὄντινα τιμήσουσι Διὸς κοῦραι μέγαλοιο
 γεινόμενόν τε ἴδωσι διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων,
 τῷ μὲν ἐπὶ γλώσσηι γλυκερὴν χεῖουσιν ἔερσην,
 τοῦ δ' ἔπε' ἐκ στόματος ῥεῖ μέλιχα·

Whomever of god-nourished kings the daughters of great Zeus honour
 and behold when he is born, on his tongue they pour sweet dew and from
 his mouth flow soothing words.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 81–84

ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὄντινα Μοῦσαι
 φίλωνται· γλυκερὴ οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή.

Blessed is the man whom the Muses love; sweet is the voice which flows
 from his mouth.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 96–97

This is not the place for an extended discussion of this passage or for the analogy which Hesiod constructs between kings and poets, but it is perhaps worth suggesting that, to a later audience brought up with the stylistic divisions of rhetorical theory, it would not have been unnatural to conclude that Hesiod made the utterances of both just kings and poets, most notably Hesiod himself of course, examples of the middle or γλαφυρόν or ἀνθηρόν style. The scholiast on v. 83 notes that γλυκερὴν refers to τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ ἀπαλὸν τῶν λόγων, “the sweetness and softness of the words”, and such softness is, as we have seen, a hallmark of this style. When the Hesiodic kings mollify the injured μαλακοῖσι ... ἐπέεσσιν “with soft words” (v. 90), it is not difficult to believe that some ancient rhetoricians would have seen here a confirmation of the correctness of a stylistic approach to these verses: the γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις, after all, prefers τὰ λειότατα καὶ μαλακώτατα, the “smoothest and softest”, among words (Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 40.1, cf. *De comp. verb.* 23.4). For Velleius Paterculus, Hesiod’s poetry was indeed marked by a *mollissima dulcedo* (1.7.1 = Hesiod T 8 Jacoby, 7 Most). Be that as it may, the assigning of Hesiod to the middle or “florid” style appears to be not merely the inevitable result of the fact that he *had to be* different from Homer, but may also arise from a “programmatic” interpretation of Hesiod’s own verses.

II

Ἡσιόδου τό τ' αἶσιμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν αἰοιδῶν
 ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
 τῶν ἐπέων ὃ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταὶ
 ῥήσεις, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης.

1 αἰοιδῶν POxy 4648 (coniecerat iam Scaliger): αἰοιδόν codd.

Hesiod's is the subject-matter and the manner: not the ultimate of songs,¹¹ but it may be that the man from Soli has caught the sweetest of verses. Hail subtle lines, the sign of Aratus' sleeplessness.

Callimachus, *AP* 9.507 = *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer

This very difficult epigram¹² is a typically original Callimachean "take" on what may have been a quite common type of epigram: the poet celebrates a literary work and, in doing so, acknowledges its principal inspiration. Thus, for example, a 3rd-century BC papyrus preserves part of an epigram in which the tragedian Aristarchus is said to have "moulded" (ἀπεπλάσατο) a tragedy "from Homer's book" (*SSH* 985.10–12). Callimachus' less usual verb, ἀπεμάξατο "copied, caught the manner of" may derive from the criticism of the plastic arts,¹³ but it has regularly been associated with Aeschylus' claim in the *Frogs* to Homeric inspiration for his characters:

ὄθεν ἡμῇ φρενὴν ἀπομαξαμένη πολλὰς ἀρετὰς ἐπόησεν,
 Πατρόκλων, Τεύκρων θυμολεόντων, ἵν' ἐπαίρομ' ἄνδρα πολίτην
 ἀντεκτείνειν αὐτὸν τούτοις, ὅποταν σάλπιγγος ἀκούσῃ.

From him [i.e. Homer] my mind took its model and depicted in my poetry many acts of heroism, of Patroclus and lion-hearted Teucers, so that I might incite a citizen to seek to rival these men, whenever he heard the war-trumpet.

Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1040–1042

¹¹ For this translation, cf. further below.

¹² What follows has no claims to completeness or necessary novelty; with a poem as discussed as this one, all interpretations will to some extent have been anticipated in the literature. I hope, however, that a dogmatic mode of presentation will not be mistaken for confident certainty about the meaning of the poem. For earlier discussion and bibliographical surveys, cf. Reitzenstein (1931) 41–47, *HE* II 208–209, Reinsch-Werner (1976) 9–13, Cameron (1995) 374–379.

¹³ Cf. Asclepiades, *Anth. Plan.* 120.1 (= *HE* 1010) on Lysippus' image of Alexander, and Prioux (2007) 100–102. We may also think of "Longinus", *De subl.* 13.4 where Plato's use of Homer is (rather obscurely) compared to the "reproduction (ἀποτύπωσις) of good character by sculptures or other works of art". For the use of the term in literary criticism, cf. the scholium in MS B at Euripides, *Hippolytos* 219 (II 32 Schwartz) ἀκρως δὲ ἐρωτικὸν ἦθος ἀπεμάξατο κτλ.

A direct link between this passage and the epigram is not improbable, given Callimachus' evident familiarity elsewhere with the literary contest of the *Frogs*, and it perhaps has some interesting consequences. In Aristophanes the model text is Homer, and Homer as the martial poet *par excellence*; in Callimachus the model poet is Hesiod, opposed in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* to Homer as the poet of peace to the poet of war. The two great hexameter poets were, as we have seen, also opposed stylistically to each other—Homer the poet of grand sublimity, Hesiod the poet of smooth sweetness; it will thus be tempting to wonder whether τὸ μελιχρότατον | τῶν ἐπέων means, not “the sweetest of [Hesiod’s] verses”, but rather “the sweetest of hexameter verses”, i.e. the poetry of Hesiod.¹⁴ Aratus has chosen for his model the hexameter poetry, which *par excellence* deserves the epithet μελιχρός; in another field that prize would have gone to Sappho.

If something like this structure is present in the epigram, then there will be a strong temptation to find Homer, or at least Homeric verse, somewhere in the opening phrases, as indeed has often been done. Scaliger’s ἀοιδῶν for the transmitted ἀοιδόν has now been found in a quotation of this poem in a work on star-signs and the value of astronomy partly preserved on a 3rd-century AD papyrus (POxy 4648), and if this is the correct reading, then, as Dirk Obbink points out,¹⁵ ἔσχατον must be taken with τρόπος, “the ultimate/highest mode [i.e. Homeric epic] that poets (or, perhaps better, “poems”) can have”. This interpretation will also, to some extent, lessen the difficulty which has been felt in applying ἔσχατος in a positive sense to an individual poet;¹⁶ Pindar, *Olympian* 1.113, celebrating Hieron’s victory in the “ultimate” contest, the Olympic one, offers a good illustration of the positive force of the superlative, τὸ δ’ ἔ- | σχατον κορυφοῦται | βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπτεινε πόρσιον “the highest point is crowned by kings: look no further”. There is indeed, then, a contrast between Homer and Hesiod in these verses, but its force is not, as has often been thought, to congratulate Aratus

¹⁴ An alternative would be to understand that “the sweetest of [Hesiod’s] verses” refers to the *Works and Days* as a whole, as opposed to the other Hesiodic poems; the balance of ancient discussion of Hesiod is indeed concerned, as is Callimachus’ epigram (cf. further below), with that poem, but there is almost no surviving evidence for ancient stylistic distinctions within the Hesiodic corpus, a fact which itself is both puzzling and instructive. West (1966) 72 notes that “Hesiod has many styles”, but ancient critics did not seem to agree.

¹⁵ Obbink (2003) 62.

¹⁶ Cf. Cameron (1995) 374–375, citing *LSJ* s.v.

for choosing Hesiod rather than Homer; rather, Callimachus simply emphasises Aratus' stylistic affiliations to Hesiod, by noting that there was a grander style, the Homeric, which he could have used, but did not. What might in fact look like a criticism of both Hesiod and Aratus, οὐ τὸν αἰοιδῶν | ἔσχατον, is then (humorously) "corrected" by ὀκνέω μή, "not the ultimate mode, but—dare I say it—it was the sweetest of hexameters which ...". Callimachus' ὄκνος is induced by the fact that the following claim that Hesiod is the μελιχρότατος of poets *could* be (mis)understood as a criticism of Homer, as indeed the critical tradition shows us that it has been.

In POxy 4648 Aratus is (with a quite probable restoration) called a ζηλωτῆς οὐκ ἀγεννής, "a not unworthy imitator", of Hesiod; such an expression is obviously connected to a debate of which we learn in the ancient *Lives* of Aratus as to whether that poet was more indebted to Homer or to Hesiod.¹⁷ The principal witness to this debate is a passage in *Vita* 2 Martin:

In the composition of his verses he was an imitator of the Homeric style (χαρακτήρ). Some, however, say that he was rather an imitator of Hesiod, for just as Hesiod began the *Works and Days* with a hymn beginning "Muses of Pieria, glorifying with your song, hither and tell of Zeus", so too did Aratus begin his poem with "Let us take our beginning from Zeus". The story of the golden race is also like Hesiod, (and) many other stories also. In the first book of his work on Aratus, Boethos of Sidon says that he was not an imitator of Hesiod, but of Homer, for the style (πλάσμα) of his poetry is greater (μεῖζον) than in the case of Hesiod.

The citation of the Stoic philosopher Boethos of Sidon pushes this debate back to the 2nd century BC, and we have seen reason to find its roots reflected already in Callimachus. Of particular interest in the present context is the reason which is given for Boethos' view and which all but certainly goes back to Boethos himself: the *plasma* of the *Phainomena* is "bigger/greater" than Hesiod. As a Stoic philosopher, Boethos had an investment in finding very serious, indeed cosmic subject-matter in Aratus, and after listing other writers of *Phainomena* who had been outshone by Aratus, *Vita* 2 indeed refers to the philosophical matter of the poem. There is, however, no good reason to think that this material is still taken from Boethos,¹⁸ and we should at least entertain the old

¹⁷ Cf. *Vita* 1 p. 9.10–16 Martin, 2 p. 12.7–18 Martin, 4 p. 21.7–8 Martin, Cameron (1995) 380, Obbink (2003) 61.

¹⁸ Pace (apparently) Cameron (1995) 380.

idea¹⁹ that πλάσμα here means not “invention” (Cameron [1995] 380) or “substance” (Obbink 2003: 61), but rather “style”, a not uncommon meaning of the term in Hellenistic criticism.²⁰ Boethos would then be making a literary judgement in the general context of a theory of styles which, as all such ancient theories did, treated them as arranged in a hierarchy (*inter alia*) of “size”; whether he specifically had in mind the three- or fourfold division of style with which we are familiar cannot be ascertained, but it is clear that his judgement would sit well with the patterns which I have been tracing in this paper. Moreover, given the closeness of the bond in ancient thinking between subject and style, a poem about so “cosmic” a theme as the stars was almost *ipso facto* bound to be grand in style.

This interpretation may gain some support from the use of χαρακτήρ at the start of the passage quoted above from *Vita* 2, for this is another regular word for “style”, whether as a term for a general way of writing (“the three styles” etc.) or for the “stamp” of a particular author’s style, and it is often found in association with πλάσμα.²¹ The Homeric scholia adduce three instances of Ἡσιόδειος χαρακτήρ in Homer (Hesiod T 68 Jacoby). At *Il.* 18.39–49 the catalogue of Nereids was athetised by Zenodotus and Aristarchus, *inter alia*, “as having a Hesiodic *charaktēr*”; the reference is, of course, not purely general, but rather has a specific Hesiodic passage in mind—the Nereid catalogue of *Th.* 243–262. So too, Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus athetised the description of Niobe’s fate at *Il.* 24.614–617 because (*inter alia*) those verses are “Hesiodic in *charaktēr*, and particularly the phrase ἀμφ’ Ἀχελώϊον ἐρρώσαντο” (sch. A). Here it is also legitimate to ask whether the observation about the “Hesiodic style” of the verses, whatever we may think of its value, derives not from an aesthetic judgement, but rather from a scholarly magnification of the fact that, whereas ἐρρώσαντο is a Homeric *hapax*, ἐπερρώσαντο is found in a prominent place in Hesiod (*Th.* 8); here too, then, there is a specific “parallel” behind the assertion of “Hesiodic *charaktēr*”. We may compare *Il.* 24.30, where one of the arguments against the passage on the Judgement of Paris is that μαχλοσύνη is a “Hesiodic word” (sch. A vv. 25–30). It is perhaps also at least worth noting that, in both of the instances from *Iliad* 24, the scholia find some-

¹⁹ Cf. Von Arnim, *RE* 3.603.

²⁰ It seems to have been a favourite with Philodemus, cf. LSJ s.v., *On Poems* 1.191, 197 with Janko’s notes.

²¹ Cf. Körte (1929) 79–83, Ritchie (1964) 12–13.

thing γελοῖον about the passage which is athetised and which is said to be “Hesiodic”; it was presumably fair for Homer’s champions to assume that Hesiod had lower critical standards. Finally, the scholia on *Od.* 15.74 (Menelaus to Telemachus), χρὴ ξεῖνον παρέοντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν, “cherish a guest when he is with you, and send him on his way when he wants to go”, note that the verse is omitted in many copies and that the *charaktēr* of the expression is Hesiodic. Here there is perhaps no single specific model in mind, but rather the gnomic nature of the utterance and the parallel form in which it is expressed; there are certainly Hesiodic verses close enough in expression to have prompted the critical turn to Hesiod, cf., e.g., *WD* 342 τὸν φιλέοντ’ ἐπὶ δαῖτα καλεῖν, τὸν δ’ ἐχθρὸν ἔασαι and 353 τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν καὶ τῷ προσιόντι προοεῖναι. In short, although not too much weight can be placed upon the use of *χαρακτήρ* in the *Life of Aratus*, it does seem to be used there of ‘style’ loosely defined and as a synonym of *πλάσμα*; there are therefore good grounds for a rather early dating for the stylistic differentiation of Hesiod from Homer, to which Callimachus may already allude in *Ep.* 27.

There is perhaps one further indication that Callimachus, *Ep.* 27 takes its place within the ancient opposition between Homer and Hesiod. If there is now almost universal consent that the poem of Aratus which is celebrated here is the *Phainomena*, the identity of the Hesiodic model has been disputed; the *Works and Days* is the most favoured model, but Alan Cameron probably speaks for many critics when he writes: “It was no doubt primarily the *Works and Days* that Callimachus had in mind, but he is not referring to any particular poem”.²² Nevertheless, Callimachus’ association of the *Phainomena* with Hesiodic poetry clearly “reads” Hesiod as (at least in part) a poet of the stars and/or weather-signs. If we ask what was the “essence” of Hesiod in antiquity, then one answer is given by Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1033: “workings of the land, the seasons for the crops, ploughings”. Another answer, quite compatible with this one, is *Works and Days* 383–392, “When the Pleiades rise . . .”, that passage which, in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, Hesiod is made to choose as τὸ κάλλιστον of his verses (*Contest* 12), and a passage which is precisely about the behaviour of stars and the need for mortals to watch them and to regulate their lives by them.²³ Like the *Contest*, to which I turn in Section 3, Callimachus’ epigram opposes Hesiod to

²² Cameron (1995) 378.

²³ Cf. Section III below. This passage of the *Works and Days* is also cited by the treatise preserved in POxy 4648 immediately before the citation of Callimachus, *Epigram* 27 Pf.

Homer, without in any way impugning Homer's pre-eminent position in the world of poetry.²⁴

Finally, this epigram has of course been a prime witness in the long debate about the importance of Hesiod for Hellenistic poetry. All that needs to be stressed here is that ancient stylistic assessments of Hesiod made him easy to appropriate for the rhetoric of a "new" poetry. When Callimachus reworked *Th.* 81–82 at fr. 1.37–38 immediately before the scene which made him a "second Hesiod", he claims the Hesiodic stylistic virtues of τὸ γλυκὺ, τὸ μελιχρὸν and τὸ λιγύ for his own poetry (cf. fr. 1.11, 16, 29), and the Roman "Callimacheans" copied and enriched this vocabulary many times over. "Longinus" (at least in what survives to us of *On the Sublime*) quotes no example of sublimity from Hesiod, and suppresses entirely the name of Callimachus;²⁵ there is no reason to think (and some reason not to) that "Longinus" would have included Hesiod among the poets who are ἀδιάπτωτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντη κεκαλλιγραφημένοι, "flawless and quite beautiful writers in the smooth style" (*de subl.* 33.5), but the stylistic criticism we have been tracing here shows how easy it was to find in Hesiod a model for the kind of poetry which was to come off second-best in "Longinus" scheme of things.

III

When Hesiod and Homer are asked by King Panedes each to choose the finest (κάλλιστον) passage from their verses, Hesiod chooses *WD* 383–392²⁶ and Homer chooses a passage which puts together *Il.* 13.126–133 and 13.339–344:

Πηλιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων
 ἄρχεσθ' ἀμῆτου, ἀρότοιό τε δυσσομενάων
 αἱ δὴ τοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέματα τεσσαράκοντα
 κεκρύφεται, αὐθις δὲ περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ
 φαίνονται τὰ πρῶτα χαρᾶσσομένοιο σιδήρου.
 οὗτός τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος, οἳ τε θαλάσσης
 ἐγγύθι ναιετάουσ', οἳ τ' ἄγχεα βησσήεντα

385

²⁴ Cf. Hunter (2006b) 19–20.

²⁵ Cf. Hunter forthcoming. The *Aspis* is cited unfavourably at *De subl.* 9.5.

²⁶ For the possibility that, in the original version of the *Contest*, the Hesiodic quotation was more extensive than this, cf. West (1967a) 442 n. 3, Heldmann (1982) 48–50.

πόντου κυμαίνοντος ἀπόπροθι, πίονα χῶρον 390
 ναίουσιν· γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βοωτεῖν,
 γυμνοῦς δ' ἀμάειν, ὅτ' ἂν ὤρια πάντα πέλωνται.

When the Pleiades, daughters of Atlas, rise, begin the reaping, the ploughing when they set. For forty nights and days they are hidden, and then as the year moves round they make their first appearance when the iron is sharpened. This is the rule of the plains, both for those who dwell near the sea, and those who dwell near the wooded glens far from the surge of the ocean, a rich land. Sow naked, drive the cattle naked, and reap naked, when everything is in rich season. Hesiod, *Works and Days* 383–392²⁷

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Αἴαντας δοιοῦς ἴσταντο φάλαγγες
 καρτεραί, ἃς οὔτ' ἂν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθῶν
 οὔτε κ' Ἀθηναίη λαοσσόος· οἱ γὰρ ἄριστοι
 κρινθέντες Τρῳάς τε καὶ Ἑκτορα δῖον ἔμμινον,
 φράξαντες δόρυ δουρί, σάκος σάκει προτελύμνωι· 130
 ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπιδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ,
 ψαῦον δ' ἱππόκομοι κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλοισιν
 νευόντων· ὥς πυκνοὶ ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν. 133

.....
 ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχη φθεισὶμβροτος ἐγγείησιν 339
 μακραίς, ἃς εἶχον ταμείχροας· ὅσσε δ' ἄμερδεν 340
 αὐγὴ χαλκείη κορυθίων ἀπο λαμπομενάων
 θωρήκων τε νεοσμήκων σακέων τε φαινῶν,
 ἐρχομένων ἄμυδις, μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος εἶη,
 ὅς τότε γηθήσειεν ἰδὼν πόνον οὐδ' ἀκάχοιτο.

Around the two Ajaxes stood the mighty battle-lines, with which neither Ares, had he come there, nor Athena, stirrer of armies, would have found fault, for the very best, picked men awaited the Trojans and godly Hector. They hedged spear with spear, shield with overlapping shield; shield pressed on shield, helmet on helmet, man on man, and the horsehair plumes on the bright crests touched each other as they nodded. So close did they stand to one another. [...] The battle in which men are destroyed bristled with the long, flesh-slicing spears which they held. Their eyes were dazzled by the brazen gleam from the shining helmets and fresh-polished breastplates and bright shields, as they came together. Very bold-hearted would a man be who could take pleasure in seeing that struggle and not be dismayed. Homer, *Il.* 13.126–133, 339–344

The two parts of the Homeric passage are held together by a general compatibility, a shared interest in armour, and some “echoes” (130 ~ 342, 132 ~ 341). The passages of Homer and Hesiod are, as Martin

²⁷ As cited in *Certamen* 12. γυμνοῦς in v. 392 seems to have replaced γυμνόν, but it might well have been in the original text of the *Contest*.

West put it, “clearly chosen so as to embody what [Alcidamas] wished to represent as most characteristic of and peculiar to the two poets”,²⁸ and fit very well the account of the two poets offered by the Aristophanic Aeschylus (*Frogs* 1033–1036). Just as the comic Aeschylus, with his own didactic agenda, sees Homer’s principal virtue as residing in the fact that he “taught excellent things—military formations, acts of heroism, the arming of soldiers”, so *Il.* 13.130–135 are virtually taken by the bT-scholia as a military handbook.²⁹

The two passages are, of course, also chosen with an eye to their opposition, or perhaps rather complementarity.³⁰ Homer chooses a suitably martial passage with which to fight his own contest (“man against man”), whereas Hesiod’s passage stresses not division, but rather the universality of the *nomos* which governs all men’s lives. The remarkable stress on armour in the combined Homeric passage plays off against Hesiod’s repeated γυμνός with which his passage ends; so too the metaphor in ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχῃ, “the fight bristled [like a grain field]” (cf. the scholia ad loc.),³¹ picks up the literal “reaping” with which the Hesiodic passage is framed. Peace and war are inscribed in the contrast; in Hesiod iron is sharpened for agricultural pursuits, in Homer metal is for cutting flesh. The Hesiodic passage moves from its grand opening to speak of things we know, of—to use the language of the *Frogs*—οἴκεῖα πράγματα (*Frogs* 959).³² The didactic imperatives work against any “distancing” effect which might create a barrier between the poetry and its audience (i.e. ourselves); these verses are “about us”. In Homer, however, it is awed amazement which the poetry works to create; only an Ares or an Athena could behold this sight with unalloyed pleasure. The closing verses of the passage write a mortal observer into it, but one who will

²⁸ West (1967a) 442–443.

²⁹ Cf. also the bT-scholium on vv. 340–342 “[Homer] teaches us to be concerned with the polish of our weapons”.

³⁰ Cf., e.g., Heldmann (1982) 51.

³¹ Cf. further below. In the course of a helpful note on the style of vv. 339–344, Janko suggests that here the spears “bristle like hair standing on end from terror” (i.e. the effect on the observer); this seems less likely than the more standard comparison to a grain field (an interpretation implied by the use of this passage in the *Contest* and cf. also Dio Chrys. 2.9–10). Nevertheless, ἔφριξεν certainly prepares for the introduction of the “observer”, for φρίκη and ἔκπληξις are what such descriptions should induce (cf., e.g., Plato, *Ion* 535c7–8). It is noteworthy that Apollonius imitated this passage of Homer in his description of Jason’s “reaping” of the Sown Warriors, *Argonautica* 3.1354–1358 (where see my notes).

³² It is, of course, obvious that there are analogies between the *Contest* and that of Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs*.

feel terror. On one hand, Homer's powerful mode of *enargeia* allows us to "see" the battle, but from a safe distance; as Richard Janko notes, "if we were really watching it, we could not enjoy it as we enjoy this description". Nevertheless, the contrast between the gleaming beauty of the weapons and the terrible carnage which they represent ("man-destroying . . . flesh-cutting") means that the distance from which we appreciate this passage may be "safe", but it is also fragile: we need to be very "bold-hearted" to have a purely "aesthetic" response of pleasure to this passage; we too should feel frightened, as indeed "Longinus" recognised was a proper response to "sublime" writing of this kind.

It is a natural assumption that the style of the two passages will be as opposed as the subject-matter, but analysis here is, of course, rather more difficult. Battles are the "grand" subject *par excellence* (Demetrius, *On Style* 75–76), and the passage of Homer is clearly chosen for its "weight" of style as well as of subject. It is striking that the final "heavy" verse, which Aeschylus is made to cite in the *Frogs* (v. 1403), comes from a passage which seems to recall *Il.* 13.130–131:

ἐφ' ἄρματος γὰρ ἄρμα καὶ νεκρῶι νεκρός,
ἵπποι δ' ἐφ' ἵπποις ἦσαν ἐμπεφυρμένοι

Chariot on chariot and corpse on corpse, horses on horses were piled
Aeschylus fr. 38 Radt

Here Aeschylus really is the heir of Homer, as Dionysus' response makes clear (with *Frogs* 1406 cf. Homer, *Il.* 5.302–304, 12.447–449, 20.285–287 etc). The grander the style, the more "poetic" it is; there is in fact a repeated emphasis in the scholia on the "poetic" style of these Homeric verses. It may, moreover, be useful to view the competing sets of verses through the lens of Demetrius, *On Style*; this will, of course, not provide the "authoritative" ancient stylistic appreciation, but it may act as a guide to the kinds of phenomena for which we should be looking. Thus, for example, in chapters 48 and 105 Demetrius considers how *δυσφωνία* contributes to *μέγεθος*, "since smoothness and euphony [two classic markers of Hesiodic style, as we have seen] have little place in the grand style (*ἐν μεγαλοπρεπείαι*)"; "ugliness of sound", as he further observes, "often lends weight (*ὄγκος*)". The example which Demetrius chooses is *Il.* 16.358, another battle passage concerning Ajax and Hector:

Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας αἰὲν ἐφ' Ἑκτορι χαλκοκορυστῇ

Ajax the mighty [aimed] always at bronze-helmeted Hector
Homer, *Il.* 16.358

The “ugly” clash of sounds lends grandeur and matches the grandeur of “Ajax the mighty”, as well—we might note—as echoing the martial clash actually being described. A similar analysis of (at least) *Il.* 13.126–133, and particularly the accumulation and elision of particles in vv. 126–128, would not seem beyond ancient critics.

A second subject which Demetrius considers is metaphor, which is in rhetoric a mark of the grand style (78); he in fact cites the much discussed ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχη, “the battle bristled”, from *Il.* 13.339 as an example of Homer’s wonderful use of metaphor, in which something inanimate is personified (82); so too, the bT-scholia note that the metaphor in ἔφριξεν is “poetic”. It is at least to be remarked that there is nothing in *WD* 383–392 which ancient critics would have considered metaphorical. It may also be noted in this connection that “Heraclitus” (*Hom. Probl.* 5.13–16) illustrates Homer’s obvious use of allegory from the very disputed verses (*Il.* 19.222–224) in which Odysseus compares battle to harvesting:³³ “what is said concerns agriculture, what is meant (τὸ νοούμενον) is battle”. Such an “allegorical/metaphorical” mode is for ancient critics quintessentially “poetic”; with Hesiod, however, there is no hermeneutic gap between what is said and what is meant, and such “clarity” works against poetic grandeur. With metaphor perhaps may be grouped the striking formulation of vv. 340–341, “the brazen gleam robbed the eyes ...”, which the scholiast describes as “bold” (τολμηρόν), and such boldness is of course habitually associated with the grand, sublime style; Dionysius of Halicarnassus notes that what he calls the γλαφυρά style, to which he assigns Hesiod,³⁴ avoids “everything bold and risky” (τὸ θρασὺ πᾶν καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένον, *De comp. verb.* 23.4).³⁵ As a final example from Demetrius’ textbook we may consider compound nouns and adjectives, which Demetrius again sees as a marker of the grand style (91–93). Here the contrast between the cited passages of Hesiod and Homer could hardly be clearer. After the initial Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων the Hesiodic passage is all but free of compounds; against this Homer can boast λαοσσόος, ἵπποκομοί, φθεισίμβροτος, ταμείχροας, νεοσμήκτων and θρασυκάρδιος. Here again, as with metaphor, the picture is a very clear one from the perspective of ancient stylistic criticism, and *Prolegomenon* b Pertusi (T 67 Jacoby, 127 Most) offers an explanation:

³³ On the ancient discussion of these verses, cf. Pontani (2005) 185–186.

³⁴ Cf. above p. 254 f.

³⁵ Cf. further Hunter (2007) 218.

The aim of the book is educational ... For this reason its poetic style is archaic, for it is largely free of adornments and added embellishments and metaphors. Simplicity and naturalness suit ethical discourses.

I think that many readers would think this a not unfair description of parts at least of the *Works and Days*.

The marked features of the Homeric passage to which I have pointed strongly suggest what Hesiod is not. When we turn again to attempt a more positive analysis, however, ancient critics may not seem to speak with one voice. The openness of the middle and γλαφυρόν styles to figures and poetic adornment, for example, seems to stand in opposition to the analysis I have just conducted on the basis of Demetrius, *On Style*, and yet what is most striking about *WD* 383 ff., after the grand three-word opening verse (*raro adsurgit Hesiodus* ...),³⁶ is the matched phrases and rhymes of vv. 383–387, where the musicality of the whole seems hard to deny. Less impressionistically, perhaps, in his extended discussion of χάρις “charm” in the γλαφυρὸς χαρακτήρ, Demetrius notes that repetition and anaphora can lend charm, and he quotes Sappho fr. 104a:

Ἑσπερε πάντα φέρῃς ὅσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ' Αὔως,
φέρῃς ὄιν, φέρῃς αἶγα, φέρῃς ἄπυ μᾶτερι παῖδα

Evening-star, you bring everything which bright Dawn has scattered; you bring the sheep, you bring the goat, you bring the child back to its mother
Sappho fr. 104a Voigt

Hesiod's γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βοωτεῖν, | γυμνὸν δ' ἀμάειν might perhaps have fallen under this heading also, though the subject-matter might seem less obviously “charming”; we know that Virgil's translation of this verse (*Georgics* 1.299) attracted (unfavourable) stylistic notice,³⁷ and Hesiod's verse was certainly at least memorable. Be that as it may, Dionysius notes of the γλαφυρά style:

³⁶ Dio Chrysostom makes Philip of Macedon describe *WD* 1–2 as μεγαλοπρεπῶς οὕτως εἰρημένα (2.9); Philip is trying to convince Alexander of Hesiod's merits as a poet. A sharp ancient critic, however, might well have felt the shift from the grandeur of v. 383 to the subject of v. 384 as bathetic. The very rare three-word trimeter (v. 383) is characteristic of neither Homer nor Hesiod, cf. Richardson on *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 31, Bassett (1917).

³⁷ Cf. Barchiesi (2004), and for the broader intellectual background Jocelyn (1979). It is possible that one of the stylistic “frigidities” of the Virgilian verse lay in the “mannered” chiasmus applied to very ordinary subject-matter, cf. Demetrius, *On Style* 120–121; the chiasmus itself seems at some level indebted to *WD* 384.

The appropriate figures [for this style] are those which most rouse mass crowds; these add beauty and richness, provided they are used in such a way as not to offend the ears of the hearers. Among such figures are parallelisms and assonances (παρισώσεις καὶ παρομοιώσεις), antitheses, paronomasia, antistrophe,³⁸ anaphora, and many other such figures which are features of poetic and lyric expression.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Demosthenes* 40.10

Dionysius' list shares many features with Hermogenes' account of the figures which create stylistic κάλλος (pp. 299.8–306.22 Rabe), and here we may well be reminded of the marked stylistic patterning of the proem of the *Works and Days*, verses which it is likely enough (the case can be put no more strongly than that) were influential on ancient conceptions of Hesiodic style; certainly, the proem well illustrates several of the common features of ancient prescriptions for the γλαφυρόν and ἀνθηρόν.

Homer's verses respond to the Hesiodic challenge in this, as in every, respect. The polyptoton of *Il.* 13.130–131 and the rhymes of vv. 341–342, which directly echo the rhyme of *WD* 383–384, take on Hesiod on his own terms; not even in these respects can the didactic poet write “more beautifully”. It is in keeping with this that the bT-scholia on *Il.* 13.340–342 note as χαρίεν the variety of vv. 341–342 in which each piece of armour is given a different epithet, though all emphasise the weapons' brightness.

Poetical and rhetorical figures may have been classed as “characteristic” of a particular style, but it was usually a simple task to find them in other styles also. Nevertheless, the figures listed by Dionysius and Hermogenes, and others closely related to them, are indeed very familiar features of the *Works and Days*. Nothing like a comprehensive analysis is possible here:³⁹ polyptoton (*WD* 25–26, 150–151, 182–183), anaphora (*WD* 101, 150–151, 317–319, 453–454, 578–580, 644), assonance (*WD* 243 λιμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμὸν), parallelisms (*WD* 244, 299–300, 375 (all with chiasmus), 345–348), and antithesis (311, 355, 471–472) are all memorable aspects of the poem. For us much of this will, of course, be attributable to traditional features of “wisdom literature”, but such historical considerations will not have been of concern to ancient readers of Hesiod, and in particular to critics of style. The prominence of such features within the relatively short space of the *Works and Days* gave this

³⁸ I.e. clauses which end with the same word or words (a kind of inverse anaphora).

³⁹ For the *Theogony*, cf. West (1966) 75–77.

Hesiodic poem at least a very marked stylistic flavour, and one which was clearly felt as “different from Homer”, however easily Homeric examples of such features could be adduced. In almost every aspect of his ancient reception, of course, it was that difference which determined Hesiod's fate; it will come as no surprise that conceptions of Hesiodic style cannot be divorced from the larger context of his reception in antiquity.

HESIOD AND THE ANCIENT BIOGRAPHICAL TRADITIONS

GREGORY NAGY

Introduction

This presentation examines what is said about the life and times of the poet Hesiod in two sets of ancient sources. The first set is the actual poetry ascribed to Hesiod, primarily the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. As for the second set, it consists of ancient texts that were external to that poetry.¹

On the basis of passages in Hesiodic poetry that refer to Hesiod (*Th.* 22–34; *WD* 27–41, 646–662), the following “biography” has been reconstructed in an introductory work intended for nonexperts.

Out of these passages a skeletal biography of Hesiod can be constructed along the following lines. The son of a poor emigrant from Asia Minor, born in Ascra, a small village of Boeotia, Hesiod was raised as a shepherd, but one day, without having had any training by human teachers, he suddenly found himself able to produce poetry. He attributed the discovery of this unexpected capability to a mystical experience in which the Muses themselves initiated him into the craft of poetry. He went on to achieve success in poetic competitions at least once, in Chalcis; unlike his father, he did not have to make his living on the high seas. He quarreled with his brother Perses about their inheritance, accusing him of laziness and injustice.²

In terms of such a reconstruction, this “biography” of Hesiod is distinct from the stories about Hesiod that we find in ancient texts external to Hesiodic poetry. Supposedly, those external stories “can easily be dismissed as legends, possessing little or no historical value.”³

Such a distinction between “biography” and “legends” is untenable, however, as we can see from testing the applications of these terms.

¹ Both sets of sources are analyzed in Nagy (1990b) 36–82.

² Most (2006) xii–xiii.

³ Most (2006) xvi.

"Biography" of Hesiod

First, let us test the term "biography" as applied to what is said about Hesiod in Hesiodic poetry. This term suits the argument that we need not "disbelieve" Hesiod in his role as the first-person narrator of episodes in the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. In terms of such argumentation, these episodes are "biographical" in the sense that they are "autobiographical."⁴ And, as "autobiographical" episodes, they are supposed to be at least potentially believable. Even in the case of episodes that seem unbelievable, they are supposedly still believable on the grounds that they are "autobiographical."

A prime example of such "biography" is the episode in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (22–34) where the figure of Hesiod declares that the Muses, as goddesses of poetry, initiated him into their craft. Even in the case of this episode, it has been argued, we do not have to "disbelieve" Hesiod—so long as we believe him in the case of other episodes that are more believable. Supposedly, "Hesiod himself seems to regard all these episodes as being of the same order of reality, and there is no more reason to disbelieve him in the one case than in the others."⁵

In terms of such argumentation, we may believe Hesiod because he himself believed that he was inspired by the Muses: "Apparently, Hesiod believed that he had undergone an extraordinary experience, as a result of which he could suddenly produce poetry."⁶ Among the factors contributing to Hesiod's belief, if we follow this line of reasoning, was "the awareness within himself of a new ability to compose poetry about matters past and future (hence, presumably, about matters transcending the knowledge of the human here and now, in the direction of the gods who live forever), which he interprets as a result of the Muses having breathed into him a divine voice."⁷

This line of reasoning is based on an assumption. The "reality" to be found in Hesiodic poetry is assumed to be the experiential world of a person named Hesiod who lived at a given point in history. It is as if such a reality could be reconstructed by taking literally whatever the figure of Hesiod says about himself in Hesiodic poetry.

⁴ Most (2006) xviii, xix.

⁵ Most (2006) xiii.

⁶ Most (2006) xiii.

⁷ Most (2006) xiv.

But the fact is, the primary “order of reality” to be found in Hesiodic poetry is not Hesiod the person but the poetry itself. It was this poetry that brought to life the person that is Hesiod.

What, then, can we say about the reality that was Hesiodic poetry? Let us begin with two observations about two generally recognized historical facts about the making of Hesiodic poetry:

1. Like Homeric poetry, Hesiodic poetry was basically oral poetry. I quote this succinct formulation: “Both Homeric poetry and Hesiod’s seem to presuppose a tradition of fully oral poetic composition, performance, reception, and transmission.”⁸
2. Like Homeric poetry, Hesiodic poetry was “widely disseminated” in the ancient Greek-speaking world (as is most evident in the case of the *Theogony*).⁹

The second of these two observations needs further clarification. The dissemination of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, it has been claimed, was a result of *textualization*.¹⁰ In terms of this claim, the new technology of alphabetic writing had been used to write down both Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, as early as the eighth century BC.¹¹ There is simply no evidence, however, for the use of writing to record Homeric and Hesiodic poetry as integral compositions in such an early period.¹² So, the claim that Homeric and Hesiodic compositions were widely disseminated as texts in the eighth century BC is untenable.

The same can be said more generally about the archaic era extending from the eighth through the sixth century BC: in this era, there is no evidence for any widespread dissemination of any texts of poetry.¹³

There is an alternative way, however, to explain the dissemination of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry during this archaic period. In terms of this alternative explanation, the two observations about (1) Homeric and Hesiodic poetry as oral poetry and (2) the dissemination of Homeric

⁸ Most (2006) xix–xx. Regrettably, Most’s discussion makes no reference to the foundational work of Lord (1960) / (2000) on oral poetics.

⁹ Most (2006) xxxiv.

¹⁰ Most (2006) xxxiv–xxxvi.

¹¹ Most (2006) xx–xxii.

¹² On the poetics of epigrams, which are attested already in the eighth century BC, see Nagy (1996b) 14, 35–36: as it is argued there, the poetry of epigrams shows a clear separation between the processes of composing and inscribing.

¹³ Nagy (1996b) 34–37.

and Hesiodic poetry can be integrated into a unified formulation. To put it most simply, *Homeric and Hesiodic poetry were disseminated as oral poetry*.

This unified formulation is based on (1) general observations about the factor of dissemination in oral poetry and (2) specific observations about the dissemination of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry as oral poetry:¹⁴

1. In oral poetry, composition and performance are aspects of the same process. So, when a composition is performed at different times and in different places, it can be recomposed in the process of composition-in-performance. And the ongoing recomposition-in-performance needs to be viewed diachronically as well as synchronically.¹⁵ From a synchronic point of view, the poet who performs a poem can claim to own it as his own composition in the process of recomposing it in performance. From a diachronic point of view, however, the ownership can readily be transferred from poem to poem, from poet to poet. And such transference can promote the dissemination of both the poetry and the name of the poet.
2. In the archaic period of Hellenic civilization extending roughly from the eighth through the sixth century BC, there already existed forms of oral poetry that corresponded to what was later known as Homeric and Hesiodic poetry. With the passage of time, the dissemination of these forms of poetry became more and more widespread throughout the communities of the Hellenic world. This process of ever widening dissemination, in the context of ongoing recomposition-in-performance, can be described as *pan-Hellenization*. Correspondingly, the poets who were identified with these forms of poetry, Homer and Hesiod, became more and more *pan-Hellenic*.

The term *pan-Hellenic* is derived from the ancient Greek compound noun *pan-Hellēnes* 'all Greeks', which is attested in the Hesiodic *Works and Days* (528: Πανελλήνεσσι) in the sense of referring to 'all Greeks under the sun' (526–528: ἥελιος ... Πανελλήνεσσι φαίνειν).¹⁶ This

¹⁴ What follows is a summary of the argumentation in Nagy (1990b) 38–47, relying on the fundamental work of Parry (collected writings first published in 1971) and Lord (1960)/(2000).

¹⁵ On the distinction between synchronic and diachronic approaches to the analysis of a given structure in the study of oral poetics: Nagy (2003) 1.

¹⁶ Nagy (1990b) 37.

archaic use of the compound noun *pan-Hellēnes* in the absolutizing sense of ‘all Greeks’ helps explain the later use of the non-compound noun *Hellēnes* ‘Hellenes’ to mean ‘Greeks’; earlier, that noun *Hellēnes* had been used to designate a sub-set of Greeks dwelling in Thessaly rather than any full complement of Greeks. As the linguistic evidence shows, the accentuation of the non-compound noun *Hellēnes* should be non-recessive (*Ελληνες), not recessive (ῚΕλληνες), and the fact that *Hellēnes* acquired an innovative recessive accentuation proves that its innovative meaning of ‘Greeks’ was predicated on the accentuation of the compound noun *pan-Hellēnes* in the absolutized sense of ‘all Greeks’.¹⁷ In other words, the linguistic evidence shows that the non-compound noun *Hellēnes* acquired the meaning of ‘Greeks’ from the built-in politics of the compound noun *pan-Hellēnes*, the basic meaning of which can be paraphrased this way: *Hellenes (as a subset of Greeks) and all other Greeks (as a notionally complete set of Greeks)*.¹⁸

When I said earlier that Homer and Hesiod “became more and more pan-Hellenic,” I was using the term *pan-Hellenic* in a relativized sense, despite its inherently absolutized meaning as ‘common to all Greeks’. To relativize *pan-Hellenic* is to recognize that the pan-Hellenization of Homer and Hesiod, just like other aspects of pan-Hellenism, cannot be described in absolute terms of universalization. Despite the totalizing ideology implicit in the term *pan-Hellenic*, the pan-Hellenization of Homer and Hesiod was not an absolute: it was merely a tendency toward a notional absolute.¹⁹ And, just as the concept of pan-Hellenism was in fact relative, so also *the concept of a pan-Hellenic Homer or a pan-Hellenic Hesiod was relative*, since it depended on the various appropriations of these poetic figures by the various Greek communities that claimed them as their own.

The episode about Hesiod’s initiation by the Muses in the *Theogony* dramatizes the pan-Hellenization of Hesiodic oral poetry. In the *Theogony* (54) these Muses are pictured as the daughters of the goddess *Mnēmosunē* ‘Memory’, who is the absolutized concept of poetic memory. By extension, the Muses are absolutized as the sources of this memory for the poet of the *Theogony*. And, by further extension, the poet’s memory is itself absolutized and thereby pan-Hellenized, since the Muses

¹⁷ Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ῚΕλληνες.

¹⁸ Nagy (1996b) 39 n. 40.

¹⁹ Nagy (1996b) 38–40.

are said to give him an *absolute authority* expressed in terms of an *absolute truth value*.²⁰

The word for this truth value is *alēthea*, which can be translated as ‘true things’. In the Hesiodic *Theogony* (28), the Muses are quoted as saying to Hesiod that they know how to speak *alēthea* ‘true things’. But this word *alēthea* means far more than ‘true things’. The root *lēth-* of *alēthea* means ‘forget’, which is the opposite of the root *mnē-*—meaning ‘remember’—as in the word *mnēmosunē* ‘memory’, which is also the name of the goddess who is mother of the Muses. Basically, the negativized adjective *alēthes* means ‘unforgettable’, so that *alēthea* means, literally, ‘unforgettable things’.²¹ Semantically, what is *unforgettable* is not just *memorable*, which would be a relative thing. More than that, what is unforgettable is an absolute thing. It is something that is *absolutely memorable*. It is therefore the *absolute truth*. The ‘true things’ that Hesiod learns from the Muses are *absolutely memorable* because they are *absolutely unforgettable*.²² Here are the relevant words of the Muses themselves, as quoted by the figure to whom they are said to be speaking, Hesiod:

ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
ἴδμεν δ’ εὖτ’ ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι

Shepherds living in the fields, base objects of reproach, mere bellies!

We know how to say many falsehoods [*pseudea*] that look like genuine things,

but we can also, whenever we are willing, proclaim true things [*alēthea*].

Hesiod *Th.* 26–28

There are comparable passages in the Homeric *Odyssey* that help us understand the poetic agenda of what the Muses are quoted as saying to Hesiod. One such passage (14.124–125) tells of wanderers who can tell stories as told by oral poets and who ‘are unwilling’ (*oud’ ethelousin*) to tell *alēthea* ‘true things’; instead, they *pseudontai* ‘tell falsehoods’ to their audiences because they need to eat in order to survive:

ἀλλ’ ἄλλως κομιδῆς κεχρημένοι ἄνδρες ἀλῆται
ψεύδοντ’· οὐδ’ ἐθέλουσιν ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι

²⁰ Nagy (1992), (1996c).

²¹ Detienne (1994) 5–31 / (1996) 15–33, with a critique of Heidegger’s interpretation of *alēthea* / *alētheia* and with updated polemics.

²² Nagy (1996b) 124–128.

It's no use! Wanderers in need of food
tell falsehoods, and they are unwilling to tell true things [*alēthea*].

Od. 14.124–125

So also in the case of the wandering Odysseus himself, he too behaves like such a wandering oral poet while being hosted as an unidentified guest at the court of Alkinoos the king of the Phaeacians. Before Odysseus as the unknown wanderer tells his audience of Phaeacians the entertaining tales of his woeful adventures, he asks his hosts to let him eat first (*Od.* 7.215–221), since his *gastēr* 'belly' (216) is making him 'forget' those tales of his, *lēth-anei* (221), until it is filled with food. In his role as the oral poet of his own adventures, Odysseus is like wandering oral poets who 'are unwilling' (*oud' ethelousin*) to tell *alēthea* 'true things' because they need to feed their bellies in order to survive and must therefore tell things that their audiences want to hear, which are falsehoods (again, *Od.* 14.124–125).

By contrast, the Muses of Hesiod will 'willingly' (*ethelōmen*) tell him *alēthea* 'true things' (again, *Th.* 28). We see here what amounts to a manifesto of pan-Hellenic poetry, in that the poet Hesiod is now to be freed from being a mere 'belly', which is what the Muses call him derisively when they first address him (*Th.* 26). Hesiod is now to be freed from having to tell the kinds of things he would tell in order to feed his belly for survival. Those kinds of things are *pseudea polla* 'many false things' (*Th.* 27). And a sign of the falseness of those things is that they are many, multiple. Those many false things merely look like *etuma* 'genuine things', to be contrasted with the unique things that are genuinely *alēthea* 'true'. Once Hesiod is initiated by the Muses, he is to be freed from having to say things that would please only his local audiences who are rooted in their local poetic traditions: those multiple local poetic traditions are *pseudea* 'false things' in face of the unique *alēthea* 'true things' that the Muses impart specially to Hesiod. This uniqueness is a sign of the pan-Hellenism claimed by Hesiodic poetry, which is capable of achieving something that goes beyond the reach of multiple local poetic traditions.²³

And who are these Muses who initiate Hesiod, thereby transforming him from a humble shepherd into a poet of pan-Hellenic stature? Like Hesiod, whose local origins are rooted in the region of Mount Helicon in Boeotia, these goddesses are local to the same region. At the beginning

²³ Nagy (1990b) 45.

of the Hesiodic *Theogony* (1–8), the Muses are pictured as singing and dancing in the heights of Mount Helicon. But they too, like Hesiod, are transformed. In the process of initiating Hesiod, they are relocated from Mount Helicon in Boeotia to Mount Olympus in Macedonia. And, in the process of being relocated, the Heliconian Muses are transformed into the Olympian Muses.

After the episode about Hesiod's initiation in the foothills of Mount Helicon is completed (*Th.* 22–35), we find that the Muses can now be relocated to Mount Olympus (37, 42), and, in fact, they are already described as Olympian Muses at the commencement of the episode about the poet's initiation (25). In the process of initiating Hesiod as a pan-Hellenic poet, these goddesses can begin their transformation from Heliconian into Olympian Muses. Just as we saw them descending from Helicon (9), we now see them ascending to Olympus (68). And, as Olympian Muses, they achieve pan-Hellenic status, just as Hesiod achieves pan-Hellenic status as a poet. The comparative evidence from the *Homeric Hymns* is decisive in this regard: in these *Hymns*, the ascent of gods and goddesses to the heights of Olympus is tantamount to achieving pan-Hellenic status.²⁴

As we see, then, from the internal evidence of Hesiodic poetry, the episode about the initiation of Hesiod by the Heliconian Muses is far more than a story about a poet's personal experience. It is a story that universalizes the figure of Hesiod as poet, making him a generic representative of a pan-Hellenic form of poetry.

In this light, the episode about Hesiod's initiation by the Muses seems more programmatic than "biographical."

"Legends" of Hesiod

Having tested the term "biography" as applied to what we find in Hesiodic poetry about Hesiod, we turn next to the term "legends" as applied to what we find in texts that are external to Hesiodic poetry. By contrast with the "biography" of Hesiod that is internal to Hesiodic poetry, whatever stories we find in the external texts are supposedly "legends." These stories about the life and times of Hesiod, which are "full of a wealth of circumstantial detail concerning his family, birth, poetic career, charac-

²⁴ Nagy (1990b) 56–57.

ter, death, and other matters,” are supposedly the result of “a well-attested practice of extrapolating from the extant poetic texts”; as such, these stories “probably reflect very little about the real person Hesiod.”²⁵

According to this point of view, then, the “legends” represented by these external stories provide no evidence about the “biography” of Hesiod. They provide evidence only about the “reception” of Hesiodic poetry.²⁶ As we will see, however, there is evidence for such “reception” even in the internal stories, that is, in the so-called “biography” of Hesiod that is internal to Hesiodic poetry. And, as we will also see in general, there is no justification for making a distinction between a “biography” of Hesiod that was internal to Hesiodic poetry and the “legends” about Hesiod that were external to it.

In any case, both of these terms, “biography” and “legends,” are inadequate for describing the stories about Hesiod. In the case of “biography,” the term is inadequate because it implies the existence of a documentary that narrates verifiable historical facts about the life and times of a historical person. In the case of “legends,” the term is inadequate because it implies the exact opposite of historical facts. It is as if the stories about the life and times of Hesiod had no historical value at all.

But the real historical facts are the stories themselves, which are artifacts that have their own historical reality. For an objective analysis of these stories in their historical contexts, the point of reference must be the real world in which the stories were told, not the artificial world as created by the artifice that went into the telling of the stories.

From here on, I will refrain from using either term, “biography” or “legends,” in referring to stories about the life and times of Hesiod. For the moment, it is preferable to use a more neutral term, such as “stories.”

“Life of Hesiod” and “Life of Homer” stories as myths

The artifice of telling stories about Hesiod was not a matter of *fiction*. A fiction is conventionally understood as something invented or “made up” by an individual—something that is therefore unreal. By contrast, the various stories telling about the life of Hesiod were telling something real about a reality. That reality was the poetry of Hesiod. And the art of telling about that reality was a matter of telling a *myth*, which was the myth of

²⁵ Most (2006) xvi.

²⁶ Most (2006) xvi–xvii.

Hesiod. And the same can be said, as we will see later, about the various stories telling about the life of Homer: they too were telling a *myth*, which was the myth of Homer. Hereafter, I will use this word *myth* in referring to the “Life of Hesiod” and “Life of Homer” stories.

In using this word *myth*, I have in mind the meaning of the Greek word from which it derives, *muthos*, which in its earlier phases was understood to be the telling of something that is real—real not only for an individual but also, collectively, for society. Such a usage of the noun *muthos* (and of the derivative verb *mutheisthai*) is most evident in the diction of Homeric poetry—and likewise in Hesiodic poetry, as in the *Theogony* (24).²⁷

Only in its later phases was the word *muthos* understood to be the telling of something that is unreal, as when Plato’s Socrates speaks of the *muthoi* ‘myths’ told by Homer and Hesiod as *pseudeis* ‘false’ (*Rep.* 2.377d–378c). Plato is assuming here, we should note, that “the poet takes on the role of the speaker of his poem.”²⁸ What Homer and Hesiod are saying is what their poetry is saying.

In terms of the earlier understanding of the word *muthos*, by contrast, the myths told *by* Homer and Hesiod were true, not false. And the same goes for myths told *about* Homer and Hesiod: they too were true, not false. A case in point is the use of the word *muthos* in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (24) with reference to what the Muses are quoted as saying to Hesiod in the three verses I already quoted (26–28): these verses spoken by the Muses are a notional retelling by Hesiod of the *muthos* told by the goddesses (24). This *muthos*, then, is not only *about the Muses* in the act of speaking to Hesiod: it is also *about Hesiod*. Because the Muses are speaking to him and thereby initiating him as a poet, Hesiod becomes part of the *muthos*—part of the true story.

A “Life of Hesiod” myth embedded in Hesiodic poetry

This story that tells about the initiation of Hesiod by the Muses is thus a myth in the older sense of the word *muthos*—in the sense of a true story. And this myth, embedded in Hesiodic poetry, is the most basic of all the

²⁷ Nagy (1996b) 119–127, following Martin (1989). See also Nagy (1996b) 124 on the textual variants μυθήσασθαι (from *mutheisthai*) / γηρύσασθαι in Hesiod *Th.* 28, where the wording refers to the discourse of the Muses who inspire Hesiod; that discourse is signaled as a μῦθος (*muthos*) in *Th.* 24. See also Martin (1989) 105, with reference to Hesiod *Th.* 28.

²⁸ Martin (1989) 235.

“Life of Hesiod” myths. That is because this story defines Hesiod in terms of his relationship to the Muses.

As we have already seen, the story tells how the Muses make Hesiod a pan-Hellenic poet. He achieves this status because the Heliconian Muses become Olympian Muses in the process of initiating him. And these goddesses become Olympian, as we have also seen, by virtue of the fact that the *Theogony* actually shows them ascending to take their rightful place on Mount Olympus, just as other gods and goddesses become Olympian by virtue of the fact that they too are shown ascending to Mount Olympus. We have already noted the myths that show such Olympian ascents in the *Homeric Hymns*.

Such myths about the achievement of Olympian status by a special grouping of gods are presupposed in the Homeric *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, where the pan-Hellenic status of the Olympian gods is marked by their location on Mount Olympus. In the case of the Homeric Muses, their location on Mount Olympus is made explicit when Homer as speaker invokes them all together in the *Iliad* (2.484): they are said to have their residences on the holy mountain (‘Ολύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι).

We have already seen that the pan-Hellenization of Hesiodic poetry, as defined by the Olympian Muses, can be explained in terms of oral poetry. But there is still a question about the myth that signals this pan-Hellenization in terms of Hesiod’s relationship with the Muses. Can this myth be explained in terms of oral poetry as well?

We find something close to a definitive answer in the succinct formulation I quoted earlier: “Both Homeric poetry and Hesiod’s seem to presuppose a tradition of fully oral poetic composition, performance, reception, and transmission.”²⁹

In the case of Hesiodic poetry, we can see references to all four of these aspects of oral poetry: *composition*, *performance*, *reception*, and *transmission*. These four aspects are all at work in the myth about the poet’s initiation by the Muses, as embedded in the Hesiodic *Theogony*.

²⁹ Most (2006) xix–xx.

Composition and performance

In the *Theogony*, references to the composition and performance of Hesiodic poetry are expressed by way of picturing the Muses as the models of Hesiod. The Muses ‘teach their beautiful song’ to Hesiod (22: καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδίην). So the content of Hesiodic composition emanates from them. And that content is passed on to Hesiod when the Muses literally ‘breathe’ into him the poetic *audē* ‘voice’ (31: ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδήν). The Muses are pictured as actually starting the song to be sung by Hesiod, which is their own song (105–112). Their song is a theogony in its own right, in that they sing the genesis of the gods (105: ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἑόντων). Their theogonic performance is thus the model for the performance of the Hesiodic *Theogony*. Singing the genesis of the gods, they show Hesiod how to sing it in his own right, specifying that he should be mindful of their own priority as he sings their own genesis in his song (34: σφᾶς δ’ αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖν). Their medium of performance, however, is different from the medium of Hesiod: the Muses perform their theogonic song in the mode of a *choros* ‘chorus’ of local goddesses (7: χορούς), singing and dancing in a locale sacred to them, Mount Helicon (3–4, 70).

Reception and transmission

I use the term *reception* here not in the narrow sense that applies in studies of literature, where this term conventionally refers to whatever happens after a given piece of literature is composed for *transmission* to the public. A broader sense of the term is needed when we are dealing with literary traditions that stem from oral traditions, as in the case of Hesiodic poetry.

How, then, are we to understand the phenomenon of *reception* in oral traditions? The answer has to do with the *transmission of composition* by way of *performance*. In any oral tradition, as we saw earlier, the process of composition is linked to the process of performance, and any given composition can be recomposed each time it is performed. The performer who recomposes the composition in performance may be the same performer who composed it earlier, or it may be a new performer, even a succession of new performers. The point is, such *recomposition-in-performance* is the essence of *transmission in oral traditions*.³⁰

³⁰ Nagy (2004b), with reference to the transmission of poetry attributed to Alcaeus.

This kind of *transmission* is the key to a broader understanding of *reception*. Unlike what happens in literature, where reception by the public happens only *after* a piece of literature is transmitted, reception in oral traditions happens *during* as well as *after* transmission. That is because the process of composition in oral traditions allows for recomposition on each new occasion of performance for a public that sees and hears the performer. In oral traditions, there is an organic link between reception and performance, since no performance can succeed without a successful reception by the public that sees and hears the performer or performers.

The link between reception and performance affects the actual content of the composition performed before a given public. That is because the performance of a given composition can speak about itself. For example, the performance can say things about the context of performance or even about the performer or performers. What is said, however, will be subject to change from performance to performance, and such change can actually affect the content of the composition by way of recomposition-in-performance.³¹

In terms of this broader understanding of reception, the storytelling of the various “Life of Hesiod” myths is grounded in Hesiodic poetry itself, which is oral poetry. What Hesiodic poetry says about itself, as in the case of the episode about Hesiod’s initiation by the Muses, is already a “Life of Hesiod” myth in the making.

Earlier, we noted the various references in the Hesiodic *Theogony* to the transformation of the Muses from Heliconian to Olympian status. And we also noted that this transformation reflects the pan-Hellenization of Hesiodic poetry, which is parallel to the pan-Hellenization of the Heliconian Muses who initiated Hesiod. By now we can see that the story of this pan-Hellenization, as expressed by the myth about Hesiod’s initiation by the Muses, is the story of the *reception* and *transmission* of Hesiodic poetry.

A comparable “Life of Homer” myth embedded in Homeric poetry

In Homeric poetry, there is an episode containing a comparable reference to *reception* and *transmission*. It takes place in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. This episode, as we are about to see, is an embedded myth

³¹ Nagy (1996a) 207–225.

that tells about Homer's encounter with the Delian Maidens, which is a close parallel to the embedded myth that tells about Hesiod's initiation by the Muses. By telling about Homer's encounter with these Delian Maidens, this myth is also telling about the pan-Hellenic *reception* and *transmission* of Homeric poetry as *oral poetry*.³²

In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the poet who speaks is imagined as Homer himself. In the ancient world, as we know from the explicit testimony of Thucydides (3.104.4), Homer was recognized as the poet of this *Hymn*. So we have external evidence for thinking of Homer as the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. But the point is, we also have internal evidence: as we are about to see, the identity of Homer in this *Hymn* is determined by his interaction with the Delian Maidens.

These Maidens in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* are parallel to the Muses in the Hesiodic *Theogony*. We have seen Hesiod, as poet of the *Theogony*, interacting with a chorus of Heliconian Muses. Now we will see Homer, as poet of the *Hymn to Apollo*, interacting with a chorus of Delian Maidens.

In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the Delian Maidens are described as the *therapnai* 'attendants' of the god Apollo (157), and they are addressed by the poet of the *Hymn* with the hymnic salutation *khairate* 'hail and take pleasure' (166), in conjunction with the god Apollo (165). With his salutation of *khairate* (166), the poet is asking the Delian Maidens to accept the *kharis* 'favor' of his song and to give him their 'favor', their *kharis*, in return. The hymnic salutation *khairē* / *khairate* is used in the *Homeric Hymns* to address the given god / gods presiding over the performance of each given hymn.³³ Similarly in the Hesiodic *Theogony*, the figure of Hesiod addresses the Muses with the hymnic salutation *khairate* (104) in the context of naming them, in conjunction with Apollo, as the divine sources of poetic power (94–95).

There is a symmetry here between the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and Hesiod as the poet of the *Theogony*. I focus on the fact that the Delian Maidens are addressed with the hymnic salutation *khairate* in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (166) just as the Olympian Muses are addressed with the hymnic salutation *khairate* in the *Theogony* (104). This symmetry indicates that the poet of the *Homeric Hymn* is in effect addressing the local Muses of Delos, who are divine in their own right. It is not a contradiction, however, to maintain that the Delian Maidens are simultaneously envisioned as members of a local *khōros* 'chorus' of girls

³² What follows corresponds to paragraphs 5–11 in Nagy (2006) 319–321.

³³ Nagy (1990b) 58.

or women, since the role of divinity can be appropriated by members of a chorus during choral performance.³⁴ That is to say, the Delian Maidens as a choral ensemble can reenact the local Delian Muses.

The designation of the Delian Maidens as *therapnai* 'attendants' of the god Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (157) is comparable to the designation of the generic *aoidos* 'singer' as *therapōn* 'attendant' of the Muses (Μουσάων θεράπων) in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (100). Since the feminine form *therapnē* 'attendant' is related to the masculine *therapōn* 'attendant', I suggest that the Delian Maidens as performers are surrogates of Apollo and, by extension, of his choral ensemble of Muses, just as the generic *aoidos* 'singer' in the *Theogony* is a surrogate of the Muses, and by extension, of their choral leader Apollo.

The poet's dramatized encounter with the Delian Maidens in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is parallel to Hesiod's dramatized encounter with the local Muses of Mount Helicon in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (22–34), which leads to the transformation of their local theogony into the pan-Hellenic *Theogony* sung by Hesiod—and to their own transformation into the pan-Hellenic Muses of Mount Olympus (verses 52 and thereafter).³⁵ The pan-Hellenization of the Heliconian Muses is a matter of reciprocation: they are transformed into Olympian Muses because they transform Hesiod, who is implicitly a generic *aoidos* 'singer' and master of poetic *kleos* 'fame' (*Th.* 99–101). They transform Hesiod into a pan-Hellenic figure in his own right, who articulates a single *Theogony* that notionally supersedes all other potential theogonies in its truth value (22–34).³⁶ Further, the local *humnos* of the Heliconian Muses has been transformed into the pan-Hellenic *humnos* of the Olympian Muses. The Hesiodic *Theogony* ultimately defines itself as one single continuous gigantic *humnos*.³⁷

Similarly in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the dramatized encounter of the *aoidos* 'singer' with the local Delian Maidens leads to the transformation of their local *humnos* 'hymn' to Apollo (ὑμνήσωσιν at 158; ὕμνον at 161) into the pan-Hellenic *Hymn to Apollo* sung by a man described as

³⁴ Nagy (2006) 317, 319–320; also Calame (2001) 30, 104, 110. Thucydides (3.14.5) refers to the chorus of Delian Maidens as *gunaikes* 'women'; accordingly, it may be too restrictive to say 'Delian Maidens', if the categories of choral groupings included women as well as unmarried 'maidens'; in that case, it may be preferable to use a more inclusive translation, 'Deliades'.

³⁵ Nagy (1990b) 58.

³⁶ Nagy (1996b) 124–128.

³⁷ Nagy (2008a) 2 § 15.

‘the most pleasing of all singers [*aoidoi*]’ (169). This *aoidos* ‘singer’ is further described, in the words of the Delian Maidens, as a blind man whose home is on the island of Chios (172). His *aoidai* ‘songs’, as the words of the Delian Maidens prophesy, will be supreme, performed throughout the cities of humankind (173–175).

This *aoidos* ‘singer’ of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, like Hesiod, is a master of poetic *kleos* ‘fame’: he speaks about the *kleos* of the hymn performed by the Delian Maidens (*Hymn to Apollo* 156), and he promises that he will spread that *kleos* (174) throughout all the cities he visits (173–175). The pan-Hellenization of the Delian Maidens, like the pan-Hellenization of the Heliconian Muses, is a matter of reciprocated *kleos*. The description of the blind *aoidos* from Chios who will spread the *kleos* of the Delian Maidens throughout the cities of humankind (172–175) starts with a quotation spoken by the Delian Maidens (172–173) in response to an unnamed wanderer, ‘someone’ (*tis*) who arrives in Delos and asks the Delian Maidens this question: who is the best *aoidos* of all? (169–170). When the Delian Maidens ‘respond’ (ὑποκρίνασθαι 171) to the question of this unnamed wanderer, of this ‘someone’, it is the quotation of their performed words that reciprocates the *kleos*: the quoted response of the Maidens (173–175) identifies the best *aoidos* with the *aoidos* who quotes their response about him, who will confer *kleos* on the Delian Maidens as he wanders throughout the cities of humankind.

In the riddling language of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the unnamed wanderer to Delos, this ‘someone’ whose question to the Delian Maidens is quoted in the *Hymn* (169–170), can be the same persona as the unnamed *aoidos* ‘singer’ of the *Hymn* who quotes the response of the Delian Maidens (172–173), who is the same persona as the unnamed *aoidos* who will now wander from Delos to all the cities of humankind, a bearer of the poetic *kleos* ‘fame’ that is reciprocated between him and the Maidens (174–175). This composite unnamed persona is the figure of Homer himself.

The identity of Homer in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is expressed by way of riddling and even mantic speech. The description of the ‘someone’ who has reached Delos after arduous wandering (167–168) anticipates the response (174–175) to the question ‘who?’ (169–170). That response (174–175) pictures the master singer who wanders throughout the cities of humankind. But this master singer is not explicitly named as Homer. Instead, his identity is implicit in the riddle posed by the question: he is the answer to the question ‘who?’—but he is also the ‘someone’ that asks the question ‘who?’ The response of the Delian Maidens is Homer’s own

response, since their response is quoted by him. The singer who leaves Delos with an answer loops back to the singer who arrives at Delos with a question.³⁸ This looping effect has its own significance: each time this wandering singer arrives at Delos, he becomes a regeneration of Homer as he sings in Delos. Each time the wandering figure of Homer is pictured as singing in Delos, the Delian Maidens authorize him all over again. The eternal return of Homer is made possible by the notionally eternal recycling of his songs.

In sum, the Delian Maidens are figured as local Muses whose interaction with Homer on the island of Delos transforms him into a poet of pan-Hellenic stature—while transforming them into goddesses of commensurate pan-Hellenic stature.³⁹ After his encounter with the Delian Maidens, the poet of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* becomes a pan-Hellenic celebrity: he is pictured as wandering from city to city throughout the Hellenic world (174–176). As a pan-Hellenic wanderer, Homer is said to be spreading the poetic *kleos* ‘fame’ of the Delian Maidens (174), and this fame is pictured as a reciprocation of the fame of his own poetry, which is universalized and absolutized as the best poetry that exists and will exist for all time to come (173).

The names of Hesiod and Homer

By now we have seen how the identity of Homer is defined by the local Muses of Delos just as the identity of Hesiod is defined by the local Muses of Helicon. But there is more to it. Even the names of Hesiod and Homer are defined by the Muses. These names, as we will now see, tell their own story.

The name of Hesiod is announced in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (22): it is *Hēsiodos* (Ἡσιόδοσ). I interpret the etymology of this name as **hēsi-wodos*, meaning ‘he who emits the voice’. The first part of this compound formation **hēsi-wodos* comes from the root of the verb *hienai* (ἵέναι) ‘emit’, while the second part comes from the root of the noun *audē* (αὐδή)

³⁸ In the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* (168), according to the version quoted by Thucydides (3.104.5), the wanderer who arrives at Delos is described as *allos*—seemingly some person ‘other’ than the speaker. Even in terms of this variant, my formulation holds: this seemingly ‘other’ person becomes the same person as the speaker once the response of the Delian Maidens to that ‘other’ person is actually quoted by the speaker.

³⁹ Nagy (2006) 317–322.

‘voice’.⁴⁰ And the Muses literally ‘breathe’ (*pneîn*) into him an *audē* ‘voice’ that makes him a poet (31: ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδήν). This poetic voice is his *inspiration*. There is a semantic correspondence between this etymology of **hēsi-wodos* meaning ‘he who emits the voice’ and the description of the singing Muses as ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι ‘emitting the voice’ (*Th.* 10, 43, 65, 67), which applies to these goddesses in descriptions of their singing and dancing (7–8, 63).

An analogous point can be made about the etymology of the poetic name of Homer, *Homēros* (Ὅμηρος; *Thuc.* 3.104.4). The morphology of this name can be explained as a compound formation **hom-āros* meaning ‘he who fits [the song] together’, composed of the prefix *homo-* (ὁμο-) ‘together’ and the root of the verb *arariskein* (ἀραρίσκειν).⁴¹ In Hesiodic poetry, we find a semantic correspondence between this etymology and descriptions of the Muses in the act of performing their song: in these performative contexts, the goddesses are described as φωνῇ ὁμηρεῦσαι ‘fitting things together [*homēreuein*] with their sound’ (*Th.* 39) and ἀρτιέπειαι ‘having words [*epea*] fitted [*arariskein*] together’ (*Th.* 29).⁴²

As we see even from their names, then, both Homer and Hesiod are linked with the generic function of the Muses as goddesses of poetry. “Homer” and “Hesiod” are not preexisting names of persons who happened to become poets. Rather, they are predestined names for poets in their function of practicing the poetry of the Muses. Such is the poetry attributed to Homer and Hesiod, and their names tell about this poetry.

An analogous formulation applies to whatever “Hesiod” says about Hesiod in Hesiodic poetry and whatever “Homer” says about Homer in Homeric poetry. In both cases, the basic reality of what these poets say about themselves is not some kind of reportage about their life and times. Rather, the basic reality is the poetry itself, which was understood to be the poetry of the Muses. That is why the names of both Homer and Hesiod are based on epithets describing the poetic powers of the Muses. And these poetic powers are pan-Hellenic in scope.

⁴⁰ Nagy (1990b) 47 n. 32.

⁴¹ Nagy (1979) 296–300 (17 §§ 9–13).

⁴² Nagy (2006) 321–322; also (1990a) 372–373 (12 § 66).

The symmetrical pan-Hellenization of Hesiod and Homer

The pan-Hellenization of Hesiod and Homer is expressed, as we have seen so far, in terms of their interactions with their Muses. But how exactly are these two poets pan-Hellenic? In the case of Hesiod, as we have already seen, his pan-Hellenization is expressed through the relocalization of his Muses from Helicon to Olympus. In the case of Homer, we have seen in the *Iliad* that his Muses are likewise localized at Olympus. So Olympus indicates a *symmetry* in the pan-Hellenization of Hesiod and Homer.

There are also other indications of such symmetry, including the fact that the compound noun *pan-Hellēnes* ‘all Greeks’ is attested in Homeric poetry (*Il.* 2.530) as well as in Hesiodic poetry (*WD* 528). But the most important of these indications is the dialectal texture of the poetic language common to Hesiodic and Homeric poetry. That dialectal texture is predominantly Ionic and residually Aeolic.⁴³

In the case of Hesiod, the predominance of the Ionic dialect in the language of his poetry comes as a surprise. After all, as we know from the explicit testimony of the “Life of Hesiod” stories that are interior to Hesiodic poetry, Hesiod is from Boeotia. And, as we know from the surviving linguistic evidence, the dialectal heritage of all Boeotia was predominantly Aeolic and not even residually Ionic. Still, the dialectal texture of Hesiodic poetry is predominantly Ionic—even more distinctly Ionic than the dialectal texture of Homeric poetry.⁴⁴

And the pervasive Ionic heritage of Hesiodic poetry extends from form to content. For example, the only month mentioned in the Hesiodic *Works and Days* is *Lēnaiōn* (504), which is an exclusively Ionic form.⁴⁵ Moreover, the description of the north wind as it blows over the sea from Thrace in the verses immediately following the mention of *Lēnaiōn* (*WD* 505–508) reflects a vantage point that cannot be matched with any point located in the region of Boeotia on the Helladic mainland. Rather, the Hesiodic vantage point here matches the Homeric vantage point of the Ionic-speaking populations of Asia Minor who inhabited the regions near the Hellespont and the plain of Troy, which is the poetic setting of the Homeric *Iliad*.⁴⁶ It is as if Hesiod were standing where Achilles once

⁴³ Nagy (2008b) 58–70.

⁴⁴ Nagy (1990b) 61–63.

⁴⁵ Nagy (1990b) 63.

⁴⁶ West (1978) 27.

stood as he looked out over the vast Hellespont and watched the winds swell the waves of its stormy waters (as at *Il.* 23.229–230).

In the case of Homer, by contrast, the predominance of the Ionic dialect in the language of his poetry comes as no surprise. In the “Life of Homer” myths, Homer is consistently associated with the Ionic cities of Asia Minor and its major outlying islands. The most prominent example is the myth embedded in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, where the homeland of Homer is said to be the island of Chios (172). From the surviving linguistic evidence, we know that the dialectal heritage of Chios was predominantly Ionic and residually Aeolic.⁴⁷

There was also a wide variety of other “Life of Homer” myths localized in places other than Chios, and in each case the place where the myth originated was supposed to be linked with the life and times of the poet. In most cases, these places were Ionic: that is, they were cities in the region of Asia Minor known as Ionia.

In one exceptional case, however, a city claiming to be closely linked with Homer was Aeolic: that city was Cyme, located in the region of Asia Minor known as Aeolis (Ephorus of Cyme, *FGH* 70 F 163, by way of Strabo 13.1.39 C600). It was in Cyme, according to the local tradition reported in one of the “Life of Homer” narratives, that Homer was conceived (*Homeric Vita* 1.3–17 ed. Allen).⁴⁸

In another exceptional case, a city claiming to be closely linked with Homer was known to have been Aeolic in earlier times and Ionic only in later times: that city was Smyrna. Smyrna had already turned Ionian by

⁴⁷ Bechtel (1924) 32.

⁴⁸ References to “Life of Homer” narratives will follow the edition of Allen (1912). In the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, the numbering of pages and lines follows what is found in this edition. Here are the relevant texts:

<i>Vita</i> 1	= <i>Vita Herodotea</i>	pp. 192–218
<i>Vita</i> 2	= <i>Contest of Homer and Hesiod</i>	pp. 225–238
<i>Vita</i> 3a	= Plutarchean <i>Vita</i>	pp. 238–244
<i>Vita</i> 3b	= Plutarchean <i>Vita</i>	pp. 244–245
<i>Vita</i> 4	= <i>Vita quarta</i>	pp. 245–246
<i>Vita</i> 5	= <i>Vita quinta</i>	pp. 247–250
<i>Vita</i> 6	= <i>Vita sexta</i> (the “Roman Life”)	pp. 250–253
<i>Vita</i> 7	= <i>Vita septima</i> , by way of Eustathius	pp. 253–254
<i>Vita</i> 8	= <i>Vita</i> by way of Tzetzes	pp. 254–255
<i>Vita</i> 9	= <i>Vita</i> by way of Eustathius (on <i>Iliad</i> IV 17)	p. 255
<i>Vita</i> 10	= <i>Vita</i> by way of the <i>Suda</i>	pp. 256–268
<i>Vita</i> 11	= <i>Vita</i> by way of Proclus	pp. 99–102

There is a new edition of *Vitae* 1 and 2 by Colbeaux (2005).

the time of the twenty-third Olympiad (Pausanias 5.8.7), that is, by the end of the eighth century. I quote this apt formulation: “[Smyrna], lying more than ten miles south of the [river] Hermus, and having Phocaea on the coast between it and Cyme, belonged naturally to the Ionian sphere.”⁴⁹ It was in Smyrna, according to the local tradition reported in the same “Life of Homer” narrative I cited a moment ago, that Homer was born (*Homeric Vita* 1.17–31).

As we know from the surviving linguistic evidence, the dialectal heritage of Smyrna was Ionic and only residually Aeolic; by contrast, the dialectal heritage of Cyme remained Aeolic, though heavily influenced by Ionic. Correspondingly, what we have found so far in the “Life of Homer” stories is a complex of myths that function as an *aetiology* for the Ionic and residually Aeolic heritage of Homeric poetry.⁵⁰ And this cultural heritage is aetiologized by way of representing Homer as originating directly—by way of his birth—from the city of Smyrna, which had an Ionic and residually Aeolic heritage, and indirectly—by way of his conception—from the city of Cyme, which had an Aeolic heritage that was strongly influenced by Ionic.⁵¹

In the “Life of Hesiod” stories, what we find is a comparable *aetiology* for the Ionic and residually Aeolic heritage of Hesiodic poetry. In this case, however, the aetiology takes the form of a myth that is actually embedded within Hesiodic poetry. According to this myth, which we find in the Hesiodic *Works and Days* (633–640), Hesiod originates indirectly—by way of his father—from the city of Cyme, which as we have seen had an Aeolic heritage strongly influenced by Ionic. That is, Hesiod’s father originates directly from Cyme: according to the Hesiodic *Works and Days*, he is said to have migrated from that city on the Asiatic mainland (636) to the town of Ascra on the Helladic mainland (639–640).

The path taken by Hesiod’s father, in migrating from Aeolic Cyme on the Asiatic Mainland to Aeolic Ascra on the Helladic Mainland, signals the utter collapse of this man’s mobile Asiatic past and a total validation of the stationary Helladic present represented by Hesiodic poetry. In the *Works and Days*, this stationary Helladic present is correlated with an ostentatious reference to Hesiod’s reluctance to navigate or to travel at

⁴⁹ How and Wells (1928) I 124.

⁵⁰ By *aetiology*, I mean a myth that motivates an institutional reality: see Nagy (1979) 279 (16 § 2 n. 2).

⁵¹ Nagy (2009) 2 § 15.

all: the poetry highlights the idea of Hesiod's hesitancy in crossing the waters of even the narrowest of straits—at Aulis in Boeotia—to compete in the funeral games of Amphidamas at Chalcis in Euboea (WD 646–663).⁵²

And this Hesiodic reference to Aulis is ostentatiously Homeric in theme, conjuring the themes of the Homeric *Iliad* by referring to the launching point of the Trojan War. Thus this fleeting reference to Aulis in the Hesiodic *Works and Days* is in and of itself a point of contrast between Hesiodic and Homeric poetry.⁵³

The path taken by Hesiod's father is not only a *migration* from the Asiatic Mainland to the Helladic mainland. It is in effect a *reverse migration*.⁵⁴ That is because this path represents a reverse of the myth of the *Ionian Migration*: in terms of that myth, the stationary Helladic past is relocated in the mobile Asiatic present of Ionia in Asia Minor, and the mother city is imagined as Athens on the Helladic mainland.⁵⁵

In terms of this myth of the Ionian Migration, one of the most important daughter cities of Athens was Smyrna, situated on the Asiatic mainland. According to this myth, Homer was born in Smyrna at the time of the Ionian Migration, but he was conceived on the Ionic island of Ios (Aristotle F 76 ed. Rose, via *Homeric Vitae* 3a.25–26, 3b.10, and 6.13–14). In terms of this version of the myth, Smyrna was an Ionic city. To be contrasted is a pre-Ionic version according to which Homer was born in Smyrna (*Homeric Vita* 1.17–31) but conceived in the Aeolic city of Cyme (*Vita* 1.3–17). In terms of this version of the myth, Smyrna was once an Aeolic city, like Cyme.

The linking of Athens as a metropolis or mother city with Smyrna as a daughter city is part of the myth of the *Peisistratean Recension*. This myth involves the historical figure Peisistratos, founder of a dynasty of tyrants known as the Peisistratidai, who ruled Athens in the sixth century BC. According to the myth, the shaping of which can be traced back to the historical era of the Peisistratidai themselves, the tyrant Peisistratos of Athens reassembled in Athens the poems of Homer, which had been scattered throughout the Ionian cities of Asia Minor.⁵⁶ The

⁵² On the poetic theme of Hesiod's reluctance to navigate, see Rosen (1990) and Martin (1992).

⁵³ Again, Rosen (1990) and Martin (1992); also Clay (2003) 180–189 (who does not mention Martin's article).

⁵⁴ Nagy (1990b) 73–74.

⁵⁵ Nagy (2009) E § 49.

⁵⁶ Nagy (2009) E §§ 11–47.

simplest formulation of this myth can be found in one of the “Life of Homer” stories:

περιὼν δὲ τὰς πόλεις ἤδε τὰ ποιήματα. ὕστερον δὲ Πεισίστρατος αὐτὰ
συνήγαγεν.

[Homer], as he went wandering around [*perierkhesthai*] the cities, was
singing [*āidein*] his poetic creations [*poiēmata*]; later, Peisistratos collected
them. *Homeric Vita* 4.8–10

This *Homeric Vita* goes on to add a most important detail that links Athens as a metropolis or mother city with Smyrna as a daughter city. It quotes an epigram attributed to Peisistratos himself. In this epigram, as quoted by the *Vita*, the tyrant claims that he personally reintegrated the disintegrated corpus of Homeric poetry as once performed by Homer throughout the cities of Asia Minor. And, in this context, the poetry of the epigram makes a reference to Smyrna as not only the daughter city of Athens but also the birthplace of Homer. Here are the verses of the epigram, as spoken by the persona of the tyrant himself:

τρίς με τυραννήσαντα τοσαντάκις ἐξεδίωξε
δῆμος Ἐρεχθῆος καὶ τρίς ἐπηγάγετο,
τὸν μέγαν ἐν βουλαῖς⁵⁷ Πεισίστρατον ὃς τὸν Ὅμηρον
ἥθροισα σποράδην τὸ πρὶν ἀειδόμενον·
ἡμέτερος γὰρ κείνος ὁ χρύσεος ἦν πολίτης
εἶπερ Ἀθηναῖοι Σμύρναν ἐπωκίσαμεν.

Three times was I tyrant [of Athens], and three times was I expelled
by the people of Erechtheus [= the Athenians]. Three times did they
bring me in [as tyrant],
me, Peisistratos, great in counsel. I was the one who took Homer
and put him all together. Before that, he used to be sung in a scattered
state [*sporadēn*].

You see, he was our golden citizen [*politēs*],
if it is true that we the Athenians settled [= make an *apoikia* of] Smyrna.
Homeric Vita 4.11–16

(Also attested in *Homeric Vita* 5.29–34; also in the *Greek Anthology*,
11.442.)

This epigram, it is important to add, was reputedly inscribed on the base of a statue of Peisistratos that was publicly displayed in Athens during the era of the Peisistratidai themselves (*Homeric Vita* 5.26–27).

As we learn from the complex of myths reflected in the wording of this epigram, the story of the Ionian Migration links two mythologized

⁵⁷ The version given in the *Greek Anthology* shows a variant at this point: βουλῇ.

events: (1) the birth of Homer in Ionic Smyrna and (2) the settlement of this Asiatic city by the Helladic city of Ionic Athens. By contrast, the story of the reverse migration of Hesiod's father that we find embedded in the *Works and Days* (633–640) links two corresponding mythologized events: (1) the birth of Hesiod in Aeolic Ascra and (2) his father's abandonment of the Asiatic city of Aeolic Cyme. What we saw in the case of the Hesiodic reference to Aulis in the *Works and Days* (646–663) is analogous to what we see in this case: the Hesiodic reference to Cyme, just like the reference to Aulis, highlights a point of contrast between Hesiodic and Homeric poetry.⁵⁸ In this case, Hesiod's localization in the static setting of the Helladic Mainland is being contrasted with Homer's localization in the dynamic setting of the Asiatic Mainland.

When and where did such points of contrast develop between Hesiodic and Homeric poetry? The answer has to do with an era in the city of Athens when performances of Hesiodic and Homeric poetry could in fact coexist, side by side. The sixth century BC was such an era. It was the time when the city of Athens was under the political and cultural control of the Peisistratidai.

In the sixth century BC, during the preclassical era of the Peisistratidai, Homer was understood to be the poet of not only the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* but also of other epics collectively known as the epic Cycle. And the epic poetry of this “preclassical” Homer coexisted with epic poetry attributed to other poets, especially to Hesiod. All this poetry was performed, on a seasonally recurring basis, at a major festival of Athens, the Panathenaia.⁵⁹

Part of the Hesiodic repertoire at the Panathenaia was the *Catalogue of Women*, or the *Ehoiai*. This epic narrative, which was linked directly to the Hesiodic *Theogony*, is evidently Athenian in provenience. That is, I agree with the argument that the Hesiodic *Catalogue* was composed in Athens sometime between 580 and 520 BC and that, “if the addition of [*Th.*] 965–1020 was contemporary, the range may perhaps be narrowed to [around] 540–520 [BC].”⁶⁰ The broader and the narrower time frames, (1) 580–520 and (2) 540–520, are based on dating criteria linked respectively to (1) the contents of the *Catalogue* and (2) the contents of

⁵⁸ In this context, I note that Antidoros of Cyme, who flourished sometime around the late fourth century BC and who was reputedly the first person to call himself a *grammatikos*, published a disquisition of Homer and Hesiod (scholia for Dionysius Thrax 44.6 ed. Hilgard).

⁵⁹ Nagy (2009) 1 §§ 168–179.

⁶⁰ West (1985) 136.

verses 965–1024 of the *Theogony*. In terms of these criteria, the Hesiodic *Catalogue* was composed in Athens as a “text” to be added to the “text” of the *Theogony*.

A qualification is needed here: the overall “text” of Hesiod resulted from the reception of living oral traditions. And these traditions, as we saw earlier, cannot be viewed exclusively on a synchronic level, as if they resulted in individualized poetic compositions. That is because the actual process of composition was a matter of ongoing recomposition-in-performance. And such a process, as we also saw earlier, needs to be viewed diachronically as well as synchronically.

The beginning of the *Catalogue*, Hesiod F 1, is a functioning continuation of the narrative that leaves off at verse 1020 of the *Theogony*, while verses 1019–1020 of the *Theogony* are a functioning transition into the narrative that begins with the *Catalogue*.⁶¹ This is not to say, however, that “our poet [that is, the poet of the *Catalogue*] rewrote [*sic*] the end of Hesiod’s *Theogony* in his own style.”⁶² I would say rather that the continuity of narration in the transition from *Theogony* to *Catalogue* is an aspect of the same oral traditions that resulted in the texts that we know as the *Theogony* and *Catalogue*.⁶³

Seen in this light, the composition of Hesiodic poetry is an ongoing process, extending into the ongoing reception of that poetry in Athens during the sixth century BC.

The coexistence of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry in Athens during the era of the Peisistratidai in the sixth century BC helps explain a strikingly close parallelism in the way these two distinct sets of poetry systematize the twelve Olympian gods as an elite subset of all the other gods. Such a systematization is not only a matter of poetics. It is also a matter of politics.⁶⁴ More specifically, the poetics of the system of twelve Olympian

⁶¹ West (1985) 126.

⁶² West (1985) 167.

⁶³ In terms of oral traditions, the narrative of the Hesiodic *Theogony* could also function as a preliminary to the Homeric *Iliad*: such a potential continuity of narration has been demonstrated by Muellner (1996) 94–96. In the era of the Peisistratidai, I would add, an earlier form of the *Theogony* could have been performed as a preliminary to an earlier form of the *Iliad*.

⁶⁴ Nagy (1990b) 48–49: “The Olympus of Hesiodic and Homeric poetry is a pan-Hellenic construct that elevates the gods beyond their local attributes. . . . The evolution of most major gods from most major cities into the integrated family at Olympus amounts to a synthesis that is not just artistic but political in nature, comparable with the evolution of the pan-Hellenic games known as the Olympics.” Quoted by Clay (1989) 9–10. Hence the title of her book: *The Politics of Olympus*.

gods as shared by Homeric and Hesiodic poetry derives from the politics of Athens in the era of the Peisistratidai. The cultural reality of the Olympian gods, canonically twelve in number, was grounded in the political reality of the Altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora of Athens (Herodotus 2.7.1; *IG II²* 2640).⁶⁵ Built in the era of the Peisistratidai, this Altar was the notional center of all Attica, that is, of the entire region controlled by the city of Athens, and the herms that had been set up in the various demes of Attica by Hipparkhos, son of Peisistratos, functioned as points of reference for measuring the distances between these demes and their common centerpoint as represented by the city of Athens.⁶⁶

In this context, it is relevant to add that the Peisistratidai were engaged in an aggressive political campaign to appropriate and incorporate the traditions of Boeotia into their pan-Hellenic cultural programs throughout Attica, and a sure sign is the highlighting of Boeotian traditions in Homeric poetry: a striking example is the Homeric *Catalogue of Women* in the *Odyssey* (11.225–330).⁶⁷ Just as the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* shows an abundance of Attic features, as we noted earlier, so also the Homeric *Catalogue of Women* shows an abundance of Boeotian features. And the point is, such exchanges of Attic and Boeotian features are typical of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry in the era of the Peisistratidai.

The coexistence of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry in the sixth century BC, it needs to be added, became obsolete in the fifth. By the time of the fifth century, only the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were performed at the Panathenaia, and only these two epics were attributed to Homer.⁶⁸

There is still a trace of the old coexistence, however, in a remark made by Herodotus about the symmetry of Homer and Hesiod as a pair of culture heroes who systematized pan-Hellenic thinking about the gods:

“Ὅθεν δὲ ἐγένετο ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν, εἴτε δὴ αἰεὶ ἦσαν πάντες, ὁκοῖοί τέ τινες τὰ εἶδεα, οὐκ ἠπιστέατο μέχρι οὗ πρῶν τε καὶ χθὲς ὥς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ. Ἡσίοδον γάρ καὶ Ὅμηρον ἡλικίῃν τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μὲν πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοσι· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἑλλήσι καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες καὶ τιμὰς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἶδεα αὐτῶν σημνῆντες· οἱ δὲ πρότερον ποιηταὶ λεγόμενοι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν γενέσθαι ὕστερον, ἔμοιγε δοκέειν, ἐγένοντο.

⁶⁵ Larson (2000) 213–214.

⁶⁶ Larson (2000) 213.

⁶⁷ Larson (2000), especially pp. 204–205.

⁶⁸ Nagy (2009) 1 §§ 35–54.

But it was just the day before yesterday, so to speak, that they [= the Hellenes] came to understand where each of the gods originated from, whether they all existed always, and what they were like in their visible forms [*eidos* plural]. For Hesiod and Homer, I think, lived not more than four hundred years ago. These are the men who composed [*poieîn*] a theogony [*theogonia*] for the Hellenes, who gave epithets to the gods, who distinguished their various spheres of influence [*timai*] and spheres of activity [*tekhnai*], and who indicated [*sēmainein*] their [= the gods'] visible forms [*eidos* plural]. And I think that those poets who are said to have come before these men really came after them. Herodotus 2.53.1–3

By the time we reach the era of Plato in the fourth century BC, we find that the symmetry of Homer and Hesiod is well known again, at least in antiquarian intellectual circles. For example, Plato's Socrates imagines Homer and Hesiod in the act of 'performing in the manner of rhapsodes' (*rhapsōideîn*) as they 'go wandering around' (*perierkhesthai*) from city to city (Plato *Rep.* 10.600d–e: ὁ αὖ ψωδεῖν ... περικλύοντα).

The Contest of Homer and Hesiod

The stylized reference by Plato's Socrates to Homer and Hesiod as rhapsodic performers evokes the image of itinerant professional *rhapsōidoi* 'rhapsodes' who compete with each other at urban festivals. A prime example of such rhapsodic competitions is the tradition of performing Homeric and other epic poetry at the festival of the Panathenaia in the city of Athens. And these rhapsodic performances were not only competitive: they were also collaborative. At this festival, already in the era of the Peisistratidai, competing rhapsodes were required to take turns in performing sequentially the Homeric *Iliad* and *Odyssey* ("Plato" *Hipparchos* 228b–c). And there must have been some degree of collaboration in the act of competition, since the rhapsodes competing at the Panathenaia would be expected to complement each other in performing different parts of a notionally integral composition like, say, the Homeric *Iliad*.⁶⁹ I posit an analogous pattern of competitive collaboration in the rhapsodic performance of Hesiodic poetry in the era of the Peisistratidai: in this case as well, rhapsodes competing at the Panathenaia would be expected to complement each other in performing different parts of a

⁶⁹ Nagy (2002) 36–69. For a comparative perspective on the concept of competition-in-collaboration, see Nagy (1996a) 18.

notionally integral composition like, say, the *Theogony* in conjunction with the *Catalogue of Women*.

Even more than that, there must have existed a tradition of rhapsodic competition involving rival performances of Hesiodic and Homeric poetry. Traces of such a tradition survive in myths about a primordial contest between Homer and Hesiod. The most prominent example of such myths is attested in an anonymous work known as the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (= *Homeric Vita* 2 ed. Allen; hereafter cited simply as *Vita* 2).⁷⁰ According to the story as preserved in this work, Homer is defeated by Hesiod in a poetic competition held in the city of Chalcis in Euboea on the occasion of funeral games commemorating the death of a king named Amphidamas (*Vita* 2.254–255).⁷¹ In the course of this competition, Hesiod tests Homer by challenging him to perform a variety of feats in poetic improvisation (*Vita* 2.72–204). And the formal characteristics of Hesiod's quoted poetic challenges and Homer's quoted poetic responses are in fact typical of what we find in ancient reportage concerning rhapsodic competitions that actually took place in the historical period extending from the sixth into the fourth century BC.⁷²

In the text of the *Contest*, Homer is explicitly pictured as a rhapsode who wanders from city to city: ποιήσαντα γὰρ τὸν Μαργίτην Ὀμηρον περιέρχεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν ῥαψωδοῦντα 'having made [*poieîn*] the (comic poem) *Margites* (in the city of Colophon in Asia Minor), Homer went wandering around [*perierkhesthai*] from city to city, performing in the manner of rhapsodes [*rhapsōideîn*]' (2.55–56). After he is defeated by Hesiod, Homer is said to continue his life as a wandering rhapsode, and the wording echoes the earlier wording we saw just a moment ago: περιερχόμενος ἔλεγε τὰ ποιήματα 'as he went wandering around [*perierkhesthai*], he was telling his poetic creations [*poiēmata*]' (2.255).

The text of the *Contest* as we have it dates back to the mid second century AD, but it derives ultimately, as Friedrich Nietzsche was the first

⁷⁰ Unfortunately, this text is not included among the Hesiodic testimonia collected in the Loeb Classical Library volume edited by Most (2006) 154–281, who refers only in passing (pp. 163, 183) to the version of the text as included in the Loeb Classical Library volume containing Homeric testimonia, edited by West (2003) 318–353. Most relevant to the *Contest* is a detail in *Michigan Papyrus* 2754, originally published in Winter (1925), concerning the universalized reception of Homer. See Colbeaux (2005) 77.

⁷¹ In the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, there are two mutually contradictory versions about the venue. At one point, the setting for the contest of Homer and Hesiod is said to be Aulis, described as belonging to Boeotia (2.54–55). At a later point, however, the setting is said to be Chalcis in Euboea (2.68).

⁷² Collins (2004) 177–178, 185.

to argue in modern times, from the work of Alcidas of Athens, a contemporary of Plato (both flourished in the first half of the fourth century BC).⁷³ Here I find it relevant to recall the wording of Plato himself: as we saw earlier, Plato's Socrates pictures both Homer and Hesiod in the act of 'performing in the manner of rhapsodes' (*rhapsōideîn*) as they 'go wandering around' (*perierkhesthai*) from city to city (*Rep.* 10.600d–e: ὁαψωδεῖν ... περιιόντας). Elsewhere, as we saw still earlier, Plato's Socrates pictures Homer and Hesiod in the act of speaking through the rhapsodic medium of his own day when he says that 'these two poets composed false stories which they *told and still tell* to humankind' (*Rep.* 2.377d: οὗτοι γάρ που μύθους τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ψευδεῖς συντιθέντες *ἔλεγον τε καὶ λέγουσι*, emphasis mine).

It has been argued that the story of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* as mediated by Alcidas was his own invention, based on a passing reference in Hesiodic poetry to a poetic contest that Hesiod had won in Chalcis.

The story of the contest with Hesiod was based on Hesiod's own mention of a victory that he won in a poetic competition at the funeral games for Amphidamas in Chalcis (*WD* 650–659). It is ignored in the other lives [of Homer] (except that Proclus [*Homeric Vita* 11.8–12] dismisses it), and it may have been Alcidas' invention.⁷⁴

But the argument that this story was invented by Alcidas in the fourth century BC is untenable. Even in terms of this argument, it has to be admitted that the verses quoted in the text of the *Contest* as the verses of Homer and Hesiod themselves "were already current in the fifth century."⁷⁵ And there is ample evidence to show that the myths embedded in the text of the *Contest* must be far older than even the fifth century BC.⁷⁶

A major part of this evidence has to do with a pattern of symmetry that persists between the divergent stories of Hesiod and Homer after the convergent story about their contest comes to an end and the two poets go off on their separate ways. The experiences that still await Homer and Hesiod in the text of *Contest* reveal remarkable parallelisms. Here is an example.

⁷³ Nietzsche (1870); for background: West (2003) 298.

⁷⁴ West (2003) 299.

⁷⁵ West (2003) 299.

⁷⁶ Nagy (2009) 1 §§ 135–136, 139, 141–142, 151, 156, 171; 2 §§ 24–27, 30, 351; E § 23, 25–26, 44, 53–56, 58–62, 94, 110.

After he defeats Homer in the contest, Hesiod sails to Delphi, where he makes an offering to the god Apollo as a sign of his gratitude for winning a bronze tripod as a prize for his victory (*Vita* 2.215–217). It is implied that the offering made by Hesiod to the god may be the tripod itself; earlier in the narrative, he is said to have dedicated the tripod to the Heliconian Muses, composing an epigram to be inscribed on it (*Vita* 2.210–214).⁷⁷

After he is defeated by Hesiod in the contest, Homer experiences a series of new adventures (*Vita* 2.254–271), climaxing in his own journey to Delphi, where he makes an offering to the god Apollo as a sign of his gratitude for winning a silver *phialē* as a prize for composing an epigram to commemorate the death of Midas (*Vita* 2.271–276).⁷⁸ It is made explicit that the offering made by Homer to the god is the *phialē* itself, which he dedicates directly to Apollo, composing an epigram to be inscribed on it (*Vita* 2.271–272).

The symmetry of these mythological details about Homer and Hesiod can be supplemented with further details we find in texts that are independent of the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*. For example, the detail about the presence of Hesiod in Delphi can be supplemented with details provided by Pausanias (10.7.3), who says that Hesiod was expelled from a poetic contest at Delphi because he was unable to play the lyre—evidently because he was a rhapsode, and rhapsodes conventionally perform without instrumental accompaniment in the historical period.

In this case, it is not made explicit whether Hesiod is being envisioned as engaging in another poetic contest with Homer—this time in the context of a festival held in honor of Apollo at Delphi. In another case, however, it is made quite explicit that such a contest is in fact being envisioned—this time in the context of a festival held in honor of Apollo at Delos. Here is the relevant passage, referring to a contest of Homer and Hesiod that took place at Delos:

Φιλόχορος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ συντιθέναι καὶ ῥάπτειν τὴν ὥδην οὕτω φησὶν
αὐτοὺς προσκεκλησθαι. δηλοῖ δὲ ὁ Ἡσίοδος λέγων·
ἐν Δήλῳ τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὀμηρος αἰοῖδοι

⁷⁷ We should expect rival versions concerning the whereabouts of the tripod: for example, Pausanias (9.31.3) mentions an ancient tripod belonging to Hesiod that was on display in the Valley of the Muses in the region of Helicon; see also Aulus Gellius *Attic Nights* 3.11.1–5. On the idea of Hesiodic composition in the form of epigrams, see the next note.

⁷⁸ On the idea of Homeric composition in the form of epigrams, see Nagy (2004a) 51 n. 20.

μέλομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδὴν,
 Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορον, ὃν τέκε Λητώ.
 ῥαψῶδῆσαι δέ φησι πρῶτον τὸν Ἑσίοδον Νικοκλῆς.

Philochorus [FGH 328 F 212] says that they [= *rhapsōidoi*] were called that [= *rhapsōidoi*] on the basis of the idea of composing, that is, stitching together, the song. Proof for this comes from Hesiod, who says [= Hesiod F 357]:

In Delos, back then at the very beginning, I and Homer, singers [*aoidoi*], sang and danced [*melpēin*],⁷⁹ stitching together [*rhaptein*] a song in new *humnoi*, making Phoebus Apollo the object of our song, the one with the golden weapon, the one born of Leto.

Nicocles [FGH 376 F8] says that Hesiod was the first to perform rhapsodically [*rhapsōidein*]. Scholia for Pindar *Nemean* 2.1d

The combination of mythological details concerning the presence of Homer and Hesiod in Delos as well as in Delphi amounts to an *aetiology* of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* as we have it, which is part Homeric and part Hesiodic. As Richard Martin has shown, the verses of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* celebrating the god Apollo at Delphi are distinctly Hesiodic in style, whereas the verses celebrating the god Apollo at Delos are distinctly Homeric.⁸⁰ By *Hesiodic* Martin means the style characteristic of the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*; by *Homeric* he means the style characteristic of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

We have already noted that the Delian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* narrates the myth of Homer's encounter with the Delian Maidens on the island of Delos. But we have not yet noted that this myth was linked to the Delia, a seasonally recurring festival at Delos. As we will now see, this festival is relevant to the myth about Homer and Hesiod at Delos.

The festival of the Delia, as we know from historical sources including Thucydides (3.104.2–6), was understood to be the shared heritage of all Ionian Greeks—and thus a shared expression of Ionian identity. For this reason, the Peisistratidai of Athens made the political move of seizing control over Delos, thus appropriating the festival of Apollo at Delos, the Delia.⁸¹ This move, which was part of their overall policy of promoting Athens as the notional metropolis of all Ionians, was matched by another move: the Peisistratidai appropriated not only the festival of the Delia but

⁷⁹ The verb *melpēsthai* and the noun *molpē* convey the combination of singing and dancing; Nagy (1990a) 350–351 (12§ 29) n. 62 and n. 64.

⁸⁰ Martin (2000).

⁸¹ On Delos and the Peisistratidai, see Aloni (1989) 43–44.

also the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* as a formal expression of that festival. And, by way of appropriating the *Hymn*, the Peisistratidai appropriated Homer himself in the act of performing the *Hymn*. When we see Homer in the act of interacting with the Delian Maidens in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, he is in effect being pictured as performing at this festival.⁸²

The Peisistratidai appropriated not only Homer but also Hesiod, who is pictured together with Homer in the act of competitively performing a hymn to Apollo in the passage I quoted from Philochorus. And, as we noted earlier, the verses of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* celebrating the god Apollo at Delphi are distinctly Hesiodic in style, just as the verses celebrating the god Apollo at Delos are distinctly Homeric. But Hesiod, unlike Homer, is a recessive figure in the *Hymn* as we have it. In the end, the *Hymn to Apollo* survives as a Homeric hymn, not a Hesiodic one. Ultimately, that is because the Peisistratidai never succeeded in seizing control over Delphi and thus could never appropriate the festival of Apollo at Delphi, the Pythia. A modified form of control over Delphi was achieved instead by a rival Athenian family, the Alkmaionidai. The Peisistratidai controlled only Delos, not Delphi, and they could appropriate only the festival of Apollo at Delos, the Delia, but not the festival of Apollo at Delphi, the Pythia.

As a substitute for Delphi, however, the Peisistratidai managed to establish control over Ptōon, a major cult center of Apollo in Boeotia.⁸³ This political move by the Peisistratidai was a major part of their aggressive political campaign to appropriate and incorporate the traditions of Boeotia into their own pan-Hellenic cultural programs. And, in this indirect way, Hesiod of Boeotia became a spokesman for the agenda of Apollo at Delphi. Still, in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, there is no way for Hesiod to compete directly with Homer at Delphi. They can compete with each other, at least indirectly, at Delos instead.

Although neither Homer nor Hesiod is named in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, at least one of them wins out. And that winner is in this case Homer, not Hesiod. As we saw earlier, Homer's interaction with the Delian Maidens in the *Hymn* leads to his status as a pan-Hellenic celebrity: once he leaves Delos behind, he will wander from city to city throughout the Hellenic world (174–176), spreading the poetic *kleos* 'fame' of the Delian Maidens (174), and this fame will be a reciprocation

⁸² Nagy (2009) 1 §§ 139–140.

⁸³ A detailed history of this initiative of the Peisistratidai in Boeotia is provided by Larson (2000).

of the fame of his own poetry, which is thus universalized (173). And by now we see that this universalization of Homer as a spokesman for all Greeks—and, more significantly, for all Ionian Greeks—stems from his performance at the festival of the Delia in Delos.

Just as Homer's performance at Delos establishes his status as a universalized spokesman for Ionian Greeks in the era of the Peisistratidai, so also Hesiod's performance at Delos makes him a rival spokesman, at least from the standpoint of Athens as the notional metropolis of all Ionians. We have already noted the Ionic texture of Hesiodic poetry, which is symmetrical with the Ionic texture of Homeric poetry. Now we see that this symmetry is aetiolized in the myth that tells of a contest of Homer and Hesiod on the island of Delos.

The symmetry of mythological details about Homer and Hesiod can be supplemented with still further details we find in texts that are independent of the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*. An example is provided by Plutarch (*Banquet of the Seven Sages* 10 pp. 153f–154a), who says that the poet Hesiod was put to the test by a poet named Lesches during the contest of Homer and Hesiod at Chalcis; in this version of the myth, there are other poets involved in the contest besides Homer and Hesiod, and one of them is Lesches of Lesbos, who questions Hesiod by way of quoting verses from his own poetry (Lesches *Little Iliad* F 23 ed. Allen), to which Hesiod responds by way of quoting verses of his own (p. 56.2–3 ed. Wilamowitz). In the version of the myth as we see it in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, by contrast, the verses that match closely the verses quoted by Lesches are attributed to Hesiod (*Vita* 2.97–98), whereas the verses that match closely the verses quoted by Hesiod are attributed to Homer (*Vita* 2.100–101).

The story of a poetic competition between Hesiod and Lesches, as reported by Plutarch, is analogous to the story of a poetic competition between two poets of the epic Cycle, Arctinus of Miletus and Lesches of Lesbos, as reported by Phaenias of Eresos in Lesbos, who flourished in the fourth century BC (F 33 ed. Wehrli; via Clement *Stromateis* 1.131.6). And the detail showing Hesiod being tested by a poet of the epic Cycle is a missing piece that supplements what we see in the text of the *Contest*, where Hesiod is not tested by Homer and where only Homer gets to be tested by Hesiod. In other words, this detail as reported by Plutarch fills out a parallelism that is not fully expressed in the text of the *Contest*. The parallelism of Homer and Hesiod as symmetrically matched poetic opponents is formalized in that text only at the very end, when the storytelling reaches the final phase of the contest (*Vita* 2.176–210): “It

is only when each poet is asked to recite the finest piece of his poetry that their abilities can be weighed against one another.”⁸⁴

I have saved for last what may be the most decisive piece of evidence to show that the symmetrical myths about Homer and Hesiod as embedded in the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* are not mere inventions made by antiquarians. It has to do with a variant verse reported by the scholia for the Hesiodic *Works and Days* (657a ed. Pertusi). In this variant, we find Hesiod declaring that his adversary in the poetic contest that he won in Chalcis was Homer himself:

ὔμῳ νικήσαντ' ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον

defeating god-like Homer in song, at Chalcis

instead of

ὔμῳ νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτῶντα

winning in song, (I say that I) carried away (as a prize) a tripod with
handles on it.

Hesiodic *Works and Days* 657

The variant verse mentioning Homer is also attested in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (Vita 2.213–214 ed. Allen), where it is part of an epigram ascribed to Hesiod, who reputedly composed it in celebration of his victory over Homer.

All this is not to question whether the variant verse as attested in the medieval manuscript tradition of the *Works and Days* (657) is genuine. This verse mentioning the tripod itself may be just as genuine as the verse mentioning Homer. And each one of these two alternative verses is composed in an epigrammatic style that characterizes the verses that follow (658–659) as also the verse that precedes (656). Though both of these two variant verses may be genuine, the one that directly mentions Homer must have been phased out “in the course of the poem’s crystallization into a fixed text.”⁸⁵

Hesiod the cult hero

The symmetrical myths about Homer and Hesiod as embedded in the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* provide a wealth of information, as we have seen, about the reception of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry.

⁸⁴ West (2003) 200.

⁸⁵ Nagy (1990b) 78, with further argumentation.

One kind of information has yet to be examined. It has to do with the hero cults of Homer and Hesiod. The information we find in the *Contest* concerning Homer as cult hero is particularly noteworthy (*Vita* 2.92–94, 287, 303–308).⁸⁶ In what follows, however, I confine myself to the information in the *Contest* concerning Hesiod as a cult hero in his own right.⁸⁷

I start with a myth that tells about the murder of Hesiod at the precinct of Zeus Nemeios. There is a celebrated mention of this myth by Thucydides (3.96.1), but its relevance to the hero cult of Hesiod emerges only from later sources, including the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*. According to this text (*Vita* 2.224–240), two men murder Hesiod because he allegedly seduced their sister, and the murderers then sail out to sea and throw his corpse overboard; the corpse is rescued by a school of dolphins and carried by them to a beach at Rhion, where a festival is in progress. In the text of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, it is at this point that the *Mouseion* of Alcidamas of Athens is explicitly cited as the source of the narrative (*Vita* 2.239–240).

This version of the myth, as derived from the *Mouseion* of Alcidamas, is followed in the text of the *Contest* by a second version of the myth, derived from a monograph by Eratosthenes about Hesiod (*Vita* 2.240–247). As the retelling of this second version comes to an end, it is reported that the corpse of Hesiod was eventually transferred to a tomb located in the territory of the city of Orkhomenos in Boeotia (2.247–253), and the wording of an epigram inscribed on his tomb is quoted (2.250–254). Elsewhere too, it is reported that the corpse of Hesiod was transferred to a tomb located in the territory of the city of Orkhomenos (Tzetzes *Life of Hesiod* p. 51 ed. Wilamowitz; Aristotle, *Constitution of the People of Orkhomenos* F 565 ed. Rose).

This second version differs in some important details from a third version as reported by Plutarch (*Banquet of the Seven Sages* 19 p. 162c–e): according to that third version, the people of Thespiiai, another city in Boeotia, claimed that the corpse of Hesiod was not relocated at the city of Orkhomenos but remained hidden in a tomb located in West Locris, at the precinct of Zeus Nemeios. So, the myth about Hesiod as told at Thespiiai in Boeotia contradicted the myth about Hesiod as told at Orkhomenos in Boeotia.

⁸⁶ Commentary in Nagy (2009) 1 §§ 124–136.

⁸⁷ For an overall study of the hero cults of poets, including Hesiod, see Clay (2004).

At one point in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, in the first version of the myth as derived from Alcidas, it is said that the murderers of Hesiod had sailed off with his corpse and had thrown it overboard on the high seas between Euboea and Locris (*Vita* 2.231–232). The ‘Locris’ that is mentioned here must be East Locris—not West Locris, which as we have seen was where the people of Thespiiai claimed that Hesiod’s corpse was buried. But the localization of Hesiod’s murder near East Locris may not necessarily be a mistake.⁸⁸ Rather, this detail may stem from the version of the myth promoted by the people of Orkhomenos, for whom the tomb of Hesiod must not be localized in West Locris.

Such mutually contradictory claims concerning the corpse of Hesiod were tied to various different myths about the life of the poet, which in turn were tied to various different ritual practices involving the worship of Hesiod as a cult hero.⁸⁹ And the morphology of these myths about the life of Hesiod is closely parallel to the morphology of other myths about the lives of other cult heroes.⁹⁰ For example, the detail about the dolphins that rescue the corpse of Hesiod is closely parallel to a detail we find in the myth about the cult hero Melikertes / Palaimon, whose corpse is likewise rescued and carried ashore by a dolphin (Pausanias 1.44.8; scholia to Pindar, *hypothesis* for the *Isthmian Odes* ed. Drachmann).⁹¹ On the beach where the corpse of Melikertes / Palaimon was reportedly deposited, visitors could see a pine tree and an altar sacred to this cult hero, whose corpse was said be hidden inside an *aduton* ‘inner sanctum’ accessible only by way of an underground descent (Pausanias 1.44.8, 2.1.3).⁹² Such myths about the corpses of cult heroes center on the mystical theme of the hero’s resurrection after death.⁹³

As we can see, then, from the conflicting details surrounding the death of Hesiod, different locales like Thespiiai and Orkhomenos in Boeotia had different myths about the life and times of this poet, and these myths were tied to rival hero cults that were anchored in these locales. So, we cannot

⁸⁸ As claimed by West (2003) 343 n. 15.

⁸⁹ Nagy (1990b) 48–50.

⁹⁰ Brelich (1985) 322: “Così il poeta rientra perfettamente nella morfologia caratteristica dell’eroe.”

⁹¹ Pache (2004) 138, 151–152.

⁹² Pache (2004) 152.

⁹³ For more on this mystical theme, see Nagy (2001) xv–xxii. On the application of this theme to Hesiod, see Nagy (1990b) 50 n. 45; also Scodel (1980), with special reference to an epigram reportedly inscribed on Hesiod’s tomb, as quoted by Tzetzēs *Life of Hesiod* p. 51.9–10 ed. Wilamowitz (1916b).

speak of any single perspective—not to mention any single truth value inherent in these myths.

For the objective observer, the multiple truth values of these multiple “Life of Hesiod” myths need to be viewed from an empirical perspective, detached from the various different collective perspectives of ancient mythmaking. In objective terms, it is not a question of true or false storytelling in these myths. Rather, the storytelling of the various “Life of Hesiod” myths can be viewed as historical evidence for the varied reception of Hesiodic poetry by the various societies in which and through which this poetry was transmitted.

Here I come back to my earlier point about the need to view the “Life of Hesiod” traditions as historical evidence for the reception of Hesiodic poetry by the various societies in which and through which this poetry was transmitted. By now we see that the different hero cults of Hesiod as attested in different locales of Boeotia can be viewed as a significant aspect of the reception and transmission of Hesiodic poetry. An analogous point can be made about the various different hero cults of Homer as attested in different locales of Ionia, such as Smyrna, Chios, and even Delos.⁹⁴ In the case of Chios, the reception and transmission of Homeric poetry can be linked not only with a local hero cult of Homer but also with the activities of an ancient confraternity of performers known as the *Homēridai*, who claimed to be descended from Homer as their cult hero.⁹⁵ Similarly, the reception and transmission of Hesiodic poetry at Thespiiai in Boeotia can be linked with the activities of a confraternity known as the *sunthutai Mousōn Hēsioideiōn* ‘fellow-sacrificers to the Hesiodic Muses’ (*IG VII* 1785, third century BC).⁹⁶

There are traces of Hesiod’s identity as a cult hero even within Hesiodic poetry. A case in point is the episode of his dramatized encounter with the local Muses of Mount Helicon in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (22–34). The details of this encounter are strikingly parallel with details we find concerning the encounter of the poet Archilochus with the local Muses of the island of Paros, as narrated in a document directly linked to the hero cult of Archilochus on that island. This document is the Mnesiepes Inscription (*SEG* 15.517), plausibly dated to the third century BC, which memorializes the symbiotic worship of Archilochus as a cult hero with

⁹⁴ Nagy (1996a) 113 n. 34.

⁹⁵ Nagy (1996a) 113 n. 33 and (2009) 1 §§ 138–167.

⁹⁶ Nagy (1990a) 29 (1 § 22) n. 66 and (1996a) 113 n. 34.

the Muses as goddesses who share in the hero's cult.⁹⁷ This inscription contains a myth telling about a mystical encounter between Archilochus and the Muses (column II verses 23 and following):⁹⁸

It is nighttime in the countryside, and Archilochus is driving his father's cow to the city in order to sell it there. Along the way, he encounters a group of rustic women, who are the Muses in disguise. He proceeds to taunt them with derisive insults, and the disguised Muses respond by taunting him with their own derisive insults. In this carnivalesque setting, the Muses ask Archilochus to trade away the cow. Agreeing to do so if the price is right, Archilochus falls into a swoon; when he awakens, the rustic women are gone, and so, too, is the cow; but in its place Archilochus finds the lyre of poetry, a symbol of his transformation from cowherd to poet.

In the case of Hesiod, we find a comparable narrative embedded in the *Theogony*:

It is nighttime when Hesiod experiences his own encounter with the Muses (10) while he is tending his sheep (23). He too is taunted with derisive insults, as the Muses say to him: 'shepherds living in the fields, base objects of reproach, mere bellies!' (26). And he too receives from the Muses a gift that symbolizes his transformation into a poet. In this case, the gift is a scepter made from the wood of the laurel (30–31). This scepter made of laurel, which is fit for a king, is a symbol of Hesiod's transformation from shepherd to poet. And the poetry of this poet, which is a theogony, is royal poetry fit for a king—hence the scepter; by the same token, this theogony is also mantic poetry fit for a seer—hence the wood of the laurel.⁹⁹

Besides such internal evidence for a parallelism between Archilochus and Hesiod as cult heroes, there is also external evidence. For example, Plutarch speaks of these two figures as parallel cult heroes when he mentions, in passing, the two of them together (*Life of Numa* 4.9).¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Clay (2004) 10–13.

⁹⁸ Commentary in Nagy (1990b) 49.

⁹⁹ On the mantic as well as royal dimensions of theogonic poetry, see Nagy (1990b) 58–61.

¹⁰⁰ Relevant is the use of the epithet Μουσάων θεραπόντων 'therapōn [attendant] of the Muses' with reference to the generic poet in the Hesiodic *Theogony* (100), which is comparable to the use of the same epithet in a myth concerning the death of Archilochus (as reported by Galen *Protreptikos* 5): see Nagy (1979) 301–302 (18 § 1).

The pan-Hellenized Hesiod of Hesiodic poetry

We might have expected the Hesiodic *Theogony*, as a theogony, to validate the kingship of a king. From an anthropological view, that is the basic function of a localized theogony, to validate kings.¹⁰¹ In the case of the *Theogony*, however, we find no such localization. This Hesiodic composition validates no local king. Instead, it validates the kingship of Zeus who lives on Olympus. When the *Theogony* describes an ideal king (80–83), the one thing missing in the description is a scepter. We see a significant absence here, since the scepter is not to be found in the hands of the idealized king: rather, Hesiod is the one who receives the scepter in the *Theogony* (30–31). Earlier, we saw that the scepter is a symbol of Hesiod's transformation from shepherd to poet, and that the poetry of this poet is royal poetry fit for a king. But there is more to it: the former status of Hesiod as a humble shepherd is actually a part of the symbolism. In the metaphorical world of the Indo-European and Near Eastern poetic traditions that merge with each other in the social context of early Greek civilization, kings become leaders of men just as shepherds become leaders of their flocks, and the metaphor of the shepherd-king comes to life in myths about transformations of humble shepherds into mighty kings.¹⁰² The story of Hesiod's transformation in the *Theogony* is analogous: he receives the scepter from the Heliconian Muses because he is the one whom the goddesses inspire to become the spokesman for the kingship of Zeus on Olympus. And these Muses of Helicon become Muses of Olympus because Hesiod the poet becomes pan-Hellenized in the process of validating the kingship of Zeus on Olympus.

An analogous point can be made in the case of the Hesiodic *Works and Days*, which represents a form of poetry that concentrates on the symmetry of moral correctness with ritual correctness. As in the case of the *Theogony*, we might have expected the *Works and Days* to be a localized composition, grounded in the customary laws of Hesiod's own homeland in Boeotia. But there is no such localization. The perspective of the *Works and Days* is pan-Hellenic in scope, like the perspective of the *Theogony*.¹⁰³ And Hesiod's quarrel with his brother Perses is not some kind of local dispute based on localized legal concerns: it is a universalized conflict based on an absolutized distinction between what is

¹⁰¹ Nagy (1990b) 46–47, 56–61.

¹⁰² West (1997) 226–227.

¹⁰³ Detailed argumentation in Nagy (1990b) 63–79.

morally right and what is morally wrong for any Greek-speaking community: even the name of Perses conveys the negative side of this universalized conflict: it is derived from the verb *perthein* ‘destroy’, which is conventionally applied in moralizing poetic instructions warning about the destruction of communities that choose what is morally wrong over what is morally right (an outstanding example is the warning expressed in Theognis 1103–1104).¹⁰⁴

“Life of Hesiod” traditions: a brief overview

An aspect of reception and transmission in oral traditions is the making of myths about the performances of these traditions. Such myths, as we have seen, are exemplified in the “Life of Hesiod” traditions. Outside of the Greek evidence, the most salient examples of comparable “Lives of Poets” myths can be found in medieval Provençal and medieval Persian poetic traditions.¹⁰⁵

And the persona of Hesiod keeps changing within these “Life of Hesiod” traditions. At one extreme, he seems to be permanently stationary at Ascra, while at another extreme he seems to be ever on the move. He starts as a shepherd who is most knowledgeable about farming as well as herding and who declares that he has never sailed on the open sea. But then he goes to a poetic contest, crossing the strait at Aulis in Boeotia. And the next thing you know, he is a wandering poet, who travels from city to city and competes with other poets in public performances. He even makes an appearance in the most maritime of all places, the island of Delos, where he competes with Homer himself.

As we see from the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (*Vita* 2), Hesiod was identified with kings while Homer was identified with the people. A case in point is the audience attending the primal contest between Homer and Hesiod at Chalcis in Euboea: this audience, who are described simply as ‘the Hellenes’, enthusiastically acclaim Homer as the true winner over Hesiod, but the king presiding over the event overrules the will of the ‘Hellenes’ and awards the victory to Hesiod instead (*Vita* 2.176–179, 205–210). Hesiod’s association with royal authority is indicated even by the

¹⁰⁴ Nagy (1990b) 75.

¹⁰⁵ On the Provençal traditions, see Nagy (1990a) 80 (2 § 50) n. 140; on the Persian, see Davidson (2001).

internal evidence of Hesiodic poetry: his poetic authority is pictured as a substitute for royal authority in both the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.¹⁰⁶

The idea of Hesiod as a royalist would be most acceptable in the democratic era of Athens, at a time when Homeric poetry eclipsed Hesiodic poetry as the program, as it were, of the Panathenaia. In the postdemocratic era of antiquarian research, however, the royalism of Hesiod is shaded over and his anti-royalism is highlighted. According to Pausanias (1.2.3), for example, Hesiod's professed reluctance to travel and his strong attachment to a stationary way of life in the countryside can best be explained as a sure sign that this poet has completely detached himself from the company of kings. That kind of man is the Hesiod we know from the history of Hesiodic reception that persists into our own times.

¹⁰⁶ Nagy (1990b) 52–53.

ANCIENT SCHOLARSHIP ON HESIOD¹

FRANCO MONTANARI

1. It can hardly be doubted that the most ancient forms of exegesis of Hesiod's text developed in parallel and in association with the Homeric poems. They undoubtedly arose in the context of recitation by rhapsodes and involved explanation of the meanings of individual words or expressions,² allegorical interpretations of the mythic contents and probably also some elements concerning the person and lives of the poets themselves, many of which may have been quite fanciful. Plato, *Ion* 531a, rests on the presupposition that the rhapsodes, who clearly had different levels of skills, did not merely recite the poets but also interpreted them: mention is made of Homer, Hesiod and Archilochus. Isocrates, *Panath.* 18, speaks scornfully of the *sophistai* who believe they are all-knowing, and who recite the lines and wax eloquent on the poets, in particular Homer and Hesiod, offering a potpourri of the finest arguments put forward by others.³ The works of the philosophers and orators abound in quotations from the great poets of the most authoritative traditional *paideia*, who were adduced and interpreted to buttress a wealth of subjects and were taken as *maîtres à penser* with whom a rhapsode could engage in dialogue. Among these great poets, Homer enjoyed first place, closely followed by Hesiod. During the period of time extending from the archaic rhapsodes to Aristotle and his first group of pupils, a wide variety of problems concerning the texts of the poets were raised, discussed and handed down over the generations, and the same issues would later be taken up again at least in part and addressed in different perspectives in the Homeric and Hesiodic scholarship of the Hellenistic age, using different methods, different tools, and with different sensibilities.

Our documentation is gradually building up more solid evidence of critical activity focusing specifically on the personality and works of Hesiod. We know of a Περί τῆς ποιήσεως Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου by

¹ English translation by Rachel Barritt Costa.

² Like those represented in the well known fr. 233 PCG of the *Daitales* of Aristophanes: cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 15, 79; Cassio (1977) 21–36, 75–77; Montanari (2003).

³ Pfeiffer (1968) 3–15; West (1978) 63.

Hecataeus of Abdera (who lived between the 4th and 3rd century BC)⁴ and of a *Περί Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου* by Antidorus of Cyme (unknown chronology, possibly 3rd century BC).⁵ But as early as the mid 4th century BC, the sophist Alcidas certainly used biographical material concerning Homer and Hesiod in his *Mouseion*,⁶ which had some form of continuation—through how many and what kind of stages is unknown—in the small work known as *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*. The *Certamen* has come down to us in a 2nd century AD version bearing (in the only extant manuscript) the rather elaborate title *Περί Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου καὶ τοῦ γένους καὶ ἀγῶνος αὐτῶν*. However, a fragment with minor differences is found in a papyrus dating from the 3rd century BC (P.Lit.Lond. 191), which already takes us several centuries further back in time, while another papyrus (P. Michigan 2754, from the 2nd–3rd century AD) preserves the final part with the subscription *Ἀλκι]δάμαντος Περί Ὀμήρου*: this takes us back to Alcidas and thus to the 4th century BC.⁷

The well-known method of making every possible effort to derive biographical data from the works of the poets, which was consolidated and practised in the peripatetic context, found helpful supporting elements in Hesiod, who was rather given to talking about himself. Such an attitude contrasted with the anonymity that characterized the Homeric *aioidos* (and which by no means thwarted the idea of inventing a “biography of Homer”, with its inevitable variants and alternatives).⁸ Alcidas, or whoever created the story, certainly drew on the lines where Hesiod (*Works and Days*, ll. 650–660) tells of how he once went to Chalcis in Euboea to the funeral of king Amphidamas, in order to take part in the poetic competition held in honor of the deceased, and of how he emerged victorious. Hesiod makes no mention of adversaries in the contest, and the idea that one of his antagonists on that very occasion, or even his specific antagonist, was in fact Homer—who was defeated—may stem from a later date or may be a subsequent addition. On the other hand, some lines attributed to Hesiod (fr. dub. 357 M.-W., from sch. Pind. *Nem.* 2.1c [III 31, 10 Dr.]) allude to an occasion when he himself and Homer supposedly met and sang in Delos, albeit not necessarily in a competition:

⁴ Suid. ε 359 = *FGrHist* 264 T 1; West (1978) 63; Most (2006) T 131.

⁵ Pfeiffer (1968) 157–158; West (1978) 63; Most (2006) T 133: the evidence on Antidorus is in sch. Dion. Thr., *GG* I/iii p. 448, 6–7 Hilgard.

⁶ Fr. 5–7 Avezzi (1982) 38–51, with comm. (pp. 84–90) and bibliography.

⁷ Overview with bibliography in West (1978) 32 and 319 (comm. to 650–652) and West (2003) 297–300.

⁸ Cf. West (1999); Graziosi (2002).

this is clearly a different occasion from that of the *Certamen*, but it does bear some similarity, if only in the presumed contemporaneity of the two poets.

The episode of the *Certamen*, which does not appear in the *Vitae Homeri* that have been preserved, may have been a total invention of Alcidas himself or it may rest on a more ancient nucleus, formed of stories that circulated on the life of the two great poets and which sometimes included the attempt at fabricating an occasion for a competition between them, drawing on some autobiographical lines of Hesiod. These stories were subsequently channelled into a rhetorical and biographical-erudite tradition on the two most ancient and authoritative figures of Greek poetry.⁹ Yet one can hardly fail to link the problem of the *Certamen* and its origins to the information concerning ancient debate on the authenticity of the very lines involved. The source is Plutarch, who wrote a lost commentary on the *Works and Days* in four books. The fragment that concerns us is transmitted via Proclus in sch. *Op.* 650–662 (pp. 205–206 Pertusi): it informs us that, according to Plutarch, everything about the journey to Chalcis, Amphidamas and the poetic competition was interpolated, ἐμβεβλήσθαι.¹⁰ πάντα οὖν ταῦτα ληρώδη. As West comments: “In a manuscript containing scholia of Pertusi’s class *c* [p. 206, 1–2], the sentence ἀθετοῦνται δέκα στίχοι διὰ τὸ νεώτερον τῆς ἱστορίας sits rudely in the middle of Proclus. It looks like a fragment of sch. vet. If so, the athetesis was probably Alexandrian. The ten lines affected were presumably 651–660”.¹¹ One may imagine an ancient debate on the episode and on the way it unfolded: were there perhaps some who identified Homer as Hesiod’s adversary and some who argued instead that the whole thing had been invented and the lines were not authentic? Had such a suspicion given rise during the Alexandrian age to a proposal of athetesis, which Plutarch endorsed in his commentary?

2. As regards the peripatetic environment, we have a number of significant pieces of information. They can be considered as forming part of the well known interest in the personalities of the poets and their works as developed by Aristotle and his school, where on the one hand the

⁹ On the subject see Most (2006) xi–xxv, and the discussion by G. Nagy, this volume.

¹⁰ The verb is used by Plutarch with exactly this meaning in *Theseus* 20 τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἔπος ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου (fr. 298 M.-W.) Πεισίστρατον ἐξελεῖν φησιν Ἡρόας ὁ Μεγαρεύς, ὥσπερ αὖ πάλιν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου νέκυιαν τὸ Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε, θεῶν ἀριδείκτα τέκνα (scil. *Od.* 11.631).

¹¹ Cf. West (1978) 319, comm. to 650–652.

traditions that had been handed down were collected, and on the other efforts were made to infer data from analysis of the works. In addition to the analogous books on Homer, Archilochus, Euripides and Choerilus, Aristotle himself also dedicated one to Ἀπορήματα Ἡσιόδου¹² (but Hesiod is not mentioned in the *Poetics*). Heraclides of Pontus wrote a treatise in two books Περί τῆς Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου ἡλικίας: this we know from Diogenes Laertius (5.87, 5.92), who also maintained that Chamaeleon claimed that Heraclides had plagiarized a work of his with similar content.¹³ In a *Vita Homeri* we find confirmation that Heraclides was interested in investigating the chronology of the two poets and contended that Homer was more ancient than Hesiod.¹⁴ Furthermore, the famous fragment on the *Palinodia* relates that Chamaeleon had made a note stating that Stesichorus was critical not only of Homer but also of Hesiod on the question of Helen, thereby revealing that with regard to this question he took into consideration both of the two poets and their works in parallel.¹⁵

Another peripatetic, Praxiphanes, claimed to have found a copy of the *Works and Days* that lacked the proem (ll. 1–10) and which began *ex abrupto* with the reference to the two Erides (l. 11).¹⁶

¹² Cited in the *Vita Hesychii* of Aristotle, Gigon p. 28: cf. Jacoby (1930) 45; Moraux (1951) 114 ff.; Düring (1957) 87; Schwartz (1960) 610; Pfeiffer (1968) 145, n. 2; West (1978) 63, n. 4; Most (2006) lxvii and T 128.

¹³ Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 145, n. 2; West (1978) 63, n. 4; Most (2006) T 129–130, pp. 264–265. Heraclides of Pontus, fr. 22.24, fr. 176 and 177 Wehrli, with comm. pp. 122–123; fr. 1.87, 92 and fr. 105 Schütrumpf; cf. Gottschalk (1980) 2, 4, 136–137. Chamaeleon, fr. 46 Wehrli = 47 Giordano; cf. M. Corradi, “Chamaeleon”, in: *LGGA* (2007); on Chamaeleon and ancient biography, cf. Arrighetti (2007b) and (2008b), with references to the previous bibliography. A new edition of Chamaeleon, by A. Martano, was announced (with distribution of a *proekdosis*) at the Congress “Filosofi della scuola di Aristotele. Cameleonte e Prassifane”, Rome, Istituto Svizzero, 5–7 September 2007, to be published in the forthcoming Proceedings, in the framework of the Theophrastus Project (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/GrandLat/research/research-projects/theophrastus_extras): in the *proekdosis* see fr. 16, with comm. pp. 142–143.

¹⁴ *Vita Romana* (VI), 252.34–35 Allen = 52.29–30 Montanari 1979 (Heraclides Pont. fr. 177 Wehrli = fr. 105 Schütrumpf): Ἡρακλείδης μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν (*scil.* Ὀμηρον) ἀποδείκνυσι πρεσβύτερον Ἡσιόδου.

¹⁵ P.Oxy. 2506, fr. 26, col. I 1–14: Chamaeleon fr. 29 Wehrli (1969) = 29 Giordano (1990); cf. Montanari (1989) (commented edition of the fragments of Chamaeleon on papyrus), 29 4 T with bibliography.

¹⁶ *Prolegomena in Opera et Dies* Ac, Pertusi (1955) 2.7–20 (cf. *Test. et adn. cr.*, p. 1, the sch. of I. Tzetzes in *Op.* 1: see below, n. 19) = Praxiphanes fr. 22 a Wehrli = fr. 5 Brink (1946) (Aristarchus fr. 5 Waeschke [1874]); Most (2006) T 9 and 138, pp. 194–195; cf. Jacoby (1930) 45; Aly (1954) 1780; Blum (1977) 109 (Engl. transl. 52); a new edition of Praxiphanes, edited by E. Matelli, was announced on the occasion cited above in n. 13, with distribution of a *proekdosis*.

Ὅτι δὲ τὸ προοίμιόν τινες διέγραψαν ὥσπερ ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος ὀβελίζων τοὺς στίχους καὶ Πραξιφάνης, ὁ τοῦ Θεοφράστου μαθητῆς ... οὗτος μέντοι καὶ ἐντυχεῖν φησιν ἀπροοιμιάστῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ καὶ ἀρχομένῳ χωρὶς τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τῶν Μουσῶν, ἐντεῦθεν (l. 11)

οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην ἐρίδων γένος·
καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο πρόπον ἦν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀνδρὶ γράφειν ἄνευ σκηνῆς ποιη-
τικῆς ἐγγχειροῦντι καὶ πρὸ θυρῶν ὄγκον οὐκ¹⁷ ἐπιδεικνυμένῳ περιττόν.
ἐπάγεται δὲ τινας καὶ τὸ μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος λαβεῖν, Βοιωτὸν ὄντα,
τὰς Μούσας, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ (l. 1) πεποίηκεν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς Πιε-
ρίας, εἰς τὸ μὴ προσιεσθαι τὸ προοίμιον.

Some have crossed out the proem, as for example Aristarchus among others, who obelizes the verses, and Theophrastus' student Praxiphanes ... This latter says that he encountered a copy without the proem, which lacked the invocation to the Muses and began with

So there was not just one birth of Strifes after all. (transl. G. Most)
This, it would appear, was befitting to a man who sets out to write without resorting to poetic fiction and who makes no concealed show of superfluous affectation before embarking on the task. A further element inducing some not to accept the proem is the fact that the writer, as a Boeotian, does not assume that the Muses come from Helicon, as he has done in the *Theogony*, but rather from the Pieria region.

This remark is supported by a passage in Pausanias (9.31.4–5), relating (and I do not think there is any reason to cast doubt on this testimony)¹⁸ that the Boeotians living around Helicon had an ancient tradition which held that the *Works and Days* was the only work composed by Hesiod and that it began without the proem; he adds that they also showed him a copy of the poem engraved on lead and placed by a spring. A certain degree of fluctuation in the proemial parts is credible, given that the hymn to the gods which preceded (the reciting of) a poem in hexameters could easily be felt to be something independent and thus be treated separately (the *Homeric Hymns* are or derive from a collection of such proems, in the short or also in the more extensive and elaborate forms). To me it seems plausible that this aspect of ancient composition and recitation constituted, so to speak, a sort of ancient traditional basis, reflected in the differences among copies, for the philological problem that arose in the Alexandrian age, concerning the authenticity of the proems.¹⁹

¹⁷ Suppl. C.M. Mazzucchi apud Matelli, *proekdosis* (n. 15), fr. 28.

¹⁸ This was wrongly done by Wehrli (1969) 114, in contrast to Preller (1842) 24–25, and Aly (1954) 1780; cf. Most (2006) T 42, pp. 188–189; cf. also Matelli, *proekdosis* (above n. 16), fr. 28, comm. pp. 152–153.

¹⁹ On the ancient athetesis of the Hesiodic proems and the related problems, cf. Leo

The same piece of evidence also informs us that Aristarchus athetized this proem, marking it with the *obeloi*, which means he was working on a copy that did indeed have the proem. It is difficult to ascertain who may have been the source of the observation on the discrepancy compared to the proem of the *Theogony* with regard to the provenance of the Muses, but it certainly fits well with the philology of the Alexandrians (and there is nothing to rule out the possibility that it may have been more ancient and subsequently taken up again). Moreover, as far as we know, Aristarchus only athetized the proem of the *Works and Days*, unlike Crates of Mallos (as we will see shortly), who expunged both of them: and the above evidence seems to imply that the proem of the *Theogony* was considered authentic because the Muses are located in the author's homeland. The terminology clearly bears a technical character, which is extremely suggestive of a connection with the Alexandrian grammarians: both διαγράφω and ὀβερίζω²⁰ express very specific concepts and tools, respectively "delete"²¹ and "mark with the obelos to indicate athetesis", and this means that what we have here is a perfect case of "translation" of a problem springing from a concrete difference among circulating copies into a language, vision and instrumental apparatus of a philological-grammatical nature. In the past few years, the widely debated problem of the documentary foundation of the activity of the Alexandrian philologists, i.e. whether they worked on the basis of comparison among exemplars or by pure autoschediastic conjecture, has been enriched with the reactions to the opinions put forward by M.L. West,²² who follows a line that tends to discredit Alexandrian philology. Originally attributable to M. van der Valk, this line was taken up again by H. van Thiel and R. Janko, but has been strongly criticized by M. Schmidt, R. Führer, J.-F. Nardelli,

(1894) 14–16 = 354–357; West (1966) 150; Pfeiffer (1968) 220, 241; West (1978) 136–137; Broggiato (2001) xxiii and Crates F 78, with comm. p. 239; Pucci (2007) 23–24; Cingano, this volume, 102 f. In general on the hymn-proems, cf. also Janko (1981); Lamberton (1988) 44–48; Càssola (1975) lix–lxi.

²⁰ In the sch. of Tzetzes, cit. supra n. 16, a further simplification can be read: ἰστέον ὅτι Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ ἕτεροι ὀβερίζουσι τὸ προοίμιον καὶ Πραξιφάνης κτλ.

²¹ The verbs περιγράφω and διαγράφω are technical terms for materially deleting matter from a written exemplar: cf. Turner-Parsons (1987) 16; some examples have remained in the scholia: for περιγράφω cf. Nickau (1977) 10–12 and 29; Dickey (2007) 174 and 254. On the use of deletion as well as athetesis in philological practice and book-making, cf. Montanari (1998), (2002) and (2009).

²² West (1998–2000); West (2001a–b) (and [2002]); extensive critical reviews of his edition of the *Iliad* have been written by Nagy (2000) and Nardelli (2001), with subsequent responses by West (2001b); cf. also Janko (2000a).

A. Rengakos and G. Nagy, as well as by the present writer.²³ The case of the proem of the *Works and Days* takes on remarkable significance in this regard, for we have evidence both that there existed copies without the proem (as also described by Pausanias) and, in addition, that grammarians such as Aristarchus and Crates of Mallos athetized the proem itself while working on copies which did have it (Aristarchus marked it with the *obeloi*). One could hardly hope for a better example of a philological problem of editorial choice, which is paralleled by an ascertained divergence among different exemplars of the work.

Of the four known fragments of Crates concerning Hesiod,²⁴ one speaks specifically of the proems of the *Works and Days* and the *Theogony*, and states that Crates expunged both of them.²⁵ The citation can be found in an anonymous *Life of Dionysios Periegetes*,²⁶ in a passage which asserts that the proem must be linked to the context that follows it and must be suited to the specific content; it should not be so generic as to be adaptable to any work indiscriminately. Homer presents a proem (here the reference is evidently both to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*) whose content is drawn from the actual poem itself and hints at its essence, while the proems of the *Works and Days* and the *Theogony* of Hesiod could easily be set at the opening of various different poems. Therefore Crates was right to athetize them (τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἔργων καὶ Ἡμερῶν Ἡσιόδου καὶ τῆς Θεογονίας πάσης ἔστι προτάξαι ποιήσεως· διὸ καὶ ὁ Κράτης αὐτὰ κατὰ λόγον ἠθέτει, “that [sc. the proem] of Hesiod’s *Works and Days* and of the *Theogony* is a prelude for his poetry as a whole; hence Crates too athetized them, reasonably”). Going by what the source says, then, the reason for this athetesis was precisely the fact that the Hesiodic proems, in contrast to those of Homer, did not seem to be indissolubly linked to the work itself; rather, their content would have enabled them to have an independent existence as compositions, or at least to be or not to be present without impairing the whole poem. This is an important observation, and it needs to be considered very carefully.

²³ Cf. van Thiel (1992) and (1997); Schmidt (1997) and (2002); Führer-Schmidt (2001); of the long work by Nardelli (2001–2002), see above all I 52–70; Montanari (1998), (2002) and (2009); an excellent overview, which shows how the evidence on the practice of collating is far greater than is usually suggested, can be found in Rengakos (2002), with all the references.

²⁴ F 78–81 Broggiato (2001): cf. pp. xxiii, 78–80, 239–241.

²⁵ F 78 Broggiato (2001).

²⁶ Transmitted without indication of authorship by the *codex* Chisianus R.IV.20: edition in Kassel (1985) 72, 56–60.

One possible objection to this point might be that the last line of the proem (l. 10) of the *Works and Days* contains a precise reference to the “truth” the poet is about to proclaim to Perses, the brother whom Hesiod then explicitly addresses several times in connection with the feud over the inheritance and also with the modes of behavior giving rise to the reflections on ethical issues expressed in the poem. However, the fact remains that only this line is linked to the rest of the poem, whereas the previous lines (ll. 1–9) constitute a hymn to Zeus that can effectively be read independently, and the two components can be kept clearly distinct (l. 10 has no cogent syntactic links with the prior and following sentences, and one can thus imagine it may have been devised as a text bridge). Besides, the autobiographical passage inserted into the Hymn to the Muses, which constitutes the proem of the *Theogony*, likewise has nothing that explicitly connects it to the contents of the sacred story that follows in the poem, just as the “autobiographical” passage of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* (ll. 166–173) has nothing that genuinely links it to the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, even though this hymn could easily have preceded a recitation as a “proem” by Homer to a work “of his own”. Thus Crates and Aristarchus, with their philological approach, addressed a problem whose roots dated back to a much earlier time and which had left its imprint on copies still circulating at the time of Pausanias.

In this context, it is worth recalling the evidence of the so-called *Excerptum de vetere Iliade*,²⁷ according to which Crates²⁸ and Nicanor²⁹ knew an ἀρχαία Ἰλιάς whose proem was: Μούσας αἰδῶ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα κλυτότοξον. It strikes me as unlikely that there would have been only one proemial line: it is far more likely that the brief erudite *excerptum* preserves only the incipit of a proem, the length of which is today indeterminable, consisting of a hymn to the gods of poetry (the Muses) and to the god whose rage sets in motion the *Iliad* (Apollo).³⁰ Immediately afterwards comes a citation of Aristoxenus as evidence of yet another version of the Iliadic proem: ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι, / ὅππως δὴ μῆνίς τε χόλος θ' ἔλε Πηλεΐωνα / Λητοῦς τ' ἀγλαὸν υἱόν· ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆι χολωθείς. It thus becomes clear at once that

²⁷ Contained at the beginning of the codex Bibl. Naz. Roma gr. 6: latest ed. in Montanari (1979) 56; cf. Erbse (1969–1988), vol. I, p. 3 app.

²⁸ F 1 Broggiato (2001), with comm. pp. 140–141.

²⁹ Cf. F. Montana, *Nicanor* [3], in LGGA (2009); unfortunately this piece of evidence is generally neglected in the overview of the grammarian.

³⁰ West (1978) 137: “Crates knew of a version which began with a hymn to the Muses and Apollo”.

Aristoxenus' version, which begins with a line identical to *Il.* 2.484 (beginning of the *Catalogue of Ships*), in some sense reproduces the Iliadic proem that had become accepted and had been handed down by tradition, but it "condenses" the content into three lines as compared to nine, and of these three lines the first is one of pure invocation, in contrast to the strictly thematic and organic manner in which the Iliadic proem proceeds from its very first word (as had been noted even by the ancients). Therefore this is a different organic proem, specifically linked to the poem of the *Iliad*, whereas the version given by Crates and Nicanor may well have been a proem of a hymnic character and therefore distinct from the content of the poem itself (unless the only line still extant is simply the remains of another alternative form of organic proem). In other words, as far as the proem of the *Iliad* is concerned one begins to perceive the traces of a rather unstable tradition, in which the difference between an organic proem and an independent proem can be discerned, as described above.

Observation of these characteristics must have led to misgivings in reflections on archaic epic poetry, resulting in explicitly philological debate, as we have seen. One could say that the contrast of "authentic vs. spurious" for the epic proems is the translation into philological terms (Aristarchus and Crates) of the difference between "organic proem vs. independent proem" in the poetic practice of composition and recitation (hence the evidence on the existence of exemplars of the *Works and Days* without proem: Praxiphanes and Pausanias). For Homer, tradition became consolidated around organic proems, which sidelined or at least relegated to the background other proemial forms and allowed no doubts as to their authenticity thanks to their link with the authentic poems.³¹ For Hesiod, tradition became consolidated around considerably more independent proems, which led to doubts about their authorship, as testified among the scholars of the Hellenistic age. But it should be clear that this issue by no means concerns the real authorial authenticity of the proems in the sense of modern philology: it may very well be the case that an independent proem is actually authentic while an organic one

³¹ The discussions on the meaning of the Διὸς βουλή in *Il.* 1.5 perhaps retain a reflex of this problem, at least with regard to the fact that Aristarchus and Aristophanes were supporters of the close interconnection with the content of the *Iliad*, while others gave an interpretation that referred to the broader context of the sacred story: the concept of explaining Homer with Homer as in the case of the proem accentuates the aspect of its organic cohesion and close connection to the whole work. Cf. Kirk (1985) *ad loc.*; Latacz (2002) *ad loc.*; Pagès (2005).

is spurious.³² For Hesiod, the question of the authenticity of the proems did arise and the evidence on Crates' motivations clarifies the underlying reason: in the consolidated text, the Homeric proems were organically linked to the authentic poems (and only fragments of erudite memory conserved the trace of other proems for an "ancient *Iliad*"), while the Hesiodic proems had an independent character and may have been quite distinct from the poem they were linked to.³³

It seems to me quite natural to think that the consolidation of a proem with "organic" characteristics for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* represented an important stage (perhaps even the final stage) of the process through which the overall text became fixed, i.e. that it was an aspect of the history of the formation of the poems as they have been preserved and handed down to us. If the organic proem is linked to the fixed and consolidated text, the independent proem, on the other hand, can be adapted and is suggestive of a more fluid situation, which does not involve a necessary connection and allows freedom to choose a hymn to the divinity with a proemial function taken from within the repertory, and then to associate with it one or another narrative passage. Following this line of reasoning, we might go so far as to say that Hesiod, in a sense, reflects a less stabilized situation of his works as compared to the way the Homeric poems have come down to us. It is a fact that a precise cut-off of a limited narrative segment in the great overarching mythic cycle constitutes for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—and this is underlined very clearly as early as by Aristotle in the *Poetics*—a very precise element of identification and individuation, which involves a specific proem for each poem and also binds the proem closely to the poem in question. For Hesiod, it may seem highly surprising that the novelty and above all the unusual personalization of the content of the *Works and Days* (unthinkable in the framework of epic narrative of the "Homeric" type) did not necessarily involve the presence of an individual and particular organic proem: but it was precisely this feature that must have appeared striking to those among the ancients who concluded that the non organic proem handed down with the text of the poem, and connected to it only by l. 10, must be spurious.

³² "Modern scholars with few exceptions have accepted it as Hesiod's own preface, and they are certainly right": West (1978) 137, with regard to the proem of the *Works and Days*; cf. Arrighetti (1998) 380–381; personally, I am convinced of the Hesiodic authenticity of the two proems and their authorial link with the poems.

³³ See bibliogr. above, n. 19.

3. We know that in antiquity there was much debate on the authenticity of the works handed down under the name of Hesiod. The *Aspis* (*Shield of Heracles*) formed the object of in-depth investigation, and the first part of *hypothesis* A allowed for considerable insight into this controversy.³⁴

τῆς Ἀσπίδος ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ Καταλόγῳ φέρεται μέχρι στίχων ν' καὶ σ' (Hes. fr. 195 M.-W., vd. app.), διὸ καὶ ὑπώπτευκεν Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 406 Slater) ὥς οὐκ οὕσαν αὐτὴν Ἑσιόδου, ἀλλ' ἐτέρου τινὸς τὴν Ὀμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι προαιρουμένου. Μεγακλείδης³⁵ δ' Ἀθηναῖος γνήσιον μὲν οἶδε τὸ ποίημα, ἄλλως δὲ ἐπιτιμᾷ τῷ Ἑσιόδῳ· ἄλογον γάρ φησι ποιεῖν ὄπλα Ἥφαιστον τοῖς τῆς μητρὸς ἐχθροῖς. Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ φησὶν αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἕκ τε τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πάλιν τὸν Ἰόλαον ἐν τῷ Καταλόγῳ εὐρίσκειν ἥνιοχούντα Ἑρακλεῖ (Hes. fr. 230 M.-W.; Apoll. Rh. fr. XXI Michaelis). καὶ Σητσίχορος (fr. 92 Page PMG, vd. app.) δὲ φησιν Ἑσιόδου εἶναι τὸ ποίημα.

The beginning of the *Shield* is transmitted in Book 4 of the *Catalogue* up to line 56. For this reason, Aristophanes suspected that it did not belong to Hesiod but to someone else who had chosen to imitate the Homeric “Shield”. Megacleides of Athens considered the poem to be genuine but censured Hesiod: for he said it was illogical that Hephaestus should make weapons for his mother’s enemies. Apollonius Rhodius says in Book 3 that it is his (i.e. Hesiod’s), because of the style and because he finds Iolaus elsewhere in the *Catalogue* driving his chariot for Heracles. And Stesichorus says that the poem is Hesiod’s (transl. G. Most).

In its account of the different opinions on the question, this erudite *excerptum* seems to date back to Stesichorus, but Page suspects that the name of the last sentence is corrupted.³⁶ In effect, the formulation that attributes to Stesichorus an explicit declaration on Hesiodic authorship seems rather implausible, but perhaps the question should be considered from a different perspective.³⁷ Athenaeus (12.512e–f) tells us that the peripatetic Megacledes, who was active in the second half of the 4th century BC (a contemporary of Alcidas) and known for a Περὶ Ὀμήρου,³⁸ investigated the figure of Heracles and compared the way he was

³⁴ Pp. 86–87 in the OCT edition of F. Solmsen; cf. Russo (1965²) 29–31, 36–37, text pp. 67–68; Arrighetti (1998) 479 and 482, text pp. 230–231; Most (2006) T 52.

³⁵ μεγακλῆς codd., corr. Schweighäuser: the correction, supported by the comparison with the cited passage of Athenaeus, is normally accepted (but Jacoby [1930] 45, speaks of “Megacles Atheniensis”); the same may also hold for sch. *Il.* 5.640 (cf. Erbse *ad loc.*); cf. Arrighetti (1998) 482; Most (2006) T 132 = T 52.

³⁶ Cf. PMG cit., with bibliography.

³⁷ Cf. Russo (1965) 29–31, 36–37.

³⁸ Montanari (1992) (*Megacleides* 66 1T); L. Pagani, “Megacleides”, in: *LGGA* (2006).

represented by various different poets. The passage in Athenaeus begins with Μεγακλείδης ἐπιτιμᾷ τοῖς μεθ' Ὀμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδον ποιηταῖς κτλ. and goes on with considerations about the way the hero is characterized and about his attire, concluding that Stesichorus was the first to describe Heracles with a bow, club and lion skin: καὶ ταῦτα πλάσαι πρῶτον Στησίχορον τὸν Ἰμεραῖον. Overall, then, in the *hypothesis* and in Athenaeus we have two remnants of a work in which Megaclicides enquired into the variations of the representation of Heracles by poets and criticizes certain aspects of the authors' descriptions: according to our *hypothesis* he found absurd that Hesiod in the *Aspis* (which he considered authentic) says that Hephaestus constructs weapons for one who is the enemy of his mother Hera, whereas Athenaeus informs us on some considerations referring to the character and attire of Heracles in poets of a later date than Homer and Hesiod and explicitly mentions Stesichorus, albeit without the title of the work. What seems to me most probable is that Stesichorus, in a work featuring Heracles (for instance the *Cycnus*), made some reference to the *Aspis*, possibly in order to differentiate himself, but in some sense implying its Hesiodic authorship. The formulation of the *hypothesis* would thus be of a later date and may have been a form of simplification, suitable to be included in a doxography that sprang from a background of philological discussions on authenticity in the Alexandrian age.

Apollonius Rhodius argued in favor of authenticity on the basis of considerations of style and content, while Aristophanes seems rather to invoke elements of the Hesiodic manuscript tradition, i.e. the presence of ll. 1–56 in book IV of the *Catalogue of Women*, in order to express a doubt on the authorship of the *Shield of Heracles* attached to these lines. Aristophanes must have devoted considerable attention to authenticity questions, because we know that he also denied Hesiodic authorship of the *Precepts of Chiron*. The observations by Apollonius and Aristophanes imply that both of them believed the *Catalogue* to be authentic, as was also the case for Crates:³⁹ we will return to this point later (§ 5).

We have no information on the position of Aristarchus with regard to the *Aspis*, but we can certainly say that this short poem remained

³⁹ Pfeiffer (1968) 177–178; Martin (2005) 155, 167, 171–174; Cingano, this volume, 104–107. The source for the Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι is Quint. 1.1.15 (fr. 407 Slater [1986]), cf. Merkelbach-West (1967) 143–145; Most (2006) T 69 (cf. T 70, and p. lxii, where *pro* “Aristarchus” *leg.* “Aristophanes”); D'Alessio (2005b) 232; this work is likewise listed among those which, according to Pausanias (9.31.4–5, cited in § 2 above), the Boeotians of the Helicon rejected, believing that only the *Works and Days* was authentic.

among the texts that were worked on by the grammarians, although this did not dispel the doubts on its authenticity. A Ὑπόμνημα Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου, a title implying that a specific stance had been taken, was written by Epaphroditus (1st century AD).⁴⁰ The sch. *ad* Sc. 415 mentions an intervention by a certain Σέλευχος, probably the grammarian Seleucus (called Homericus), who was likewise from the early imperial age;⁴¹ this too may presuppose the attribution to Hesiod. The anonymous author of the *On the Sublime* expresses a doubtful attitude, introducing the citation of Sc. 267 with the words εἴ γε Ἡσιόδου καὶ τὴν Ἀσπίδα θετέον, while Pausanias, in the list of Hesiod's works in 9.31.5, mentions the Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι, but not the *Aspis*. Finally, in the sch. Dion. Thr., GG I/iii p. 124, 6–7 Hilgard, the small poem is explicitly called pseudoepigraphic: ἑτέρου γάρ ἐστιν, ἐπιγραφῇ δὲ καὶ ὀνόματι ἐχρήσατο τῆς Ἡσιόδου, ἵνα τῇ ἀξιοπιστίᾳ τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἀξία κριθῇ ἀναγνώσεως.

In short, the question dated back at least to the peripatetic Megacrides, and perhaps even earlier, and it remained an object of debate in the sphere of philology of the Hellenistic-Roman age. Yet despite the doubts raised, the *Aspis* remained solidly included in the Hesiodic corpus, as clearly testified by some papyri of the imperial age and by the later codices.⁴² Particularly significant is P.Oxy. 4652, a fragment of a parchment codex, which preserves remnants of a glossary of the *Aspis* circulating in the 5th century AD;⁴³ this is unequivocal evidence that it continued to enjoy a favorable reception in late antiquity.

4. We have evidence of a Homeric allegoresis starting from the 6th century BC, and it is natural to think it must have developed in parallel for Hesiod as well, obviously applied to the “inviting” content of the *Theogony*, although we have specific and precise information in this regard only from the Stoic Zeno of Citium (born around 333 BC). The material has recently been studied in depth by K. Algra and here we can briefly outline his results:⁴⁴ “Zeno of Citium provided physical

⁴⁰ Braswell–Billerbeck (2007) 40 and 319–326, fr. 54–55, Martano (2004a).

⁴¹ See Russo (1965) 36 and comm. *ad loc.*; Müller (1891); cf. F. Razzetti, “Seleucus [3] Homericus”, in: *LGGA* (2002); see § 5 below.

⁴² Russo (1965) 37.

⁴³ Edition by D. Obbink in *P.Oxy.* LXVIII, 2003, pp. 69–75; cf. Martano (2004b); Stroppa (2008). A. Martano has devoted various studies to the tradition of ancient exegesis on the *Aspis*: see the bibliography.

⁴⁴ Algra (2001).

interpretations of elements of Greek myth as they can be found in Hesiod's *Theogonia* ... His purpose was not so much to defend the (consistency of the) old poet, nor to provide a sophisticated and enlightened version of traditional religion, but rather to 'appropriate' Hesiodic myth and to use it in support of his own Stoic cosmology and cosmogony" (p. 562).

The earliest specific mention of Hesiod's *Theogony* in Latin literature can be found in Cicero, *Nat. deor.* 1.36 = Zeno *SVF* I 167:

Zeno autem ... cum vero Hesiodi Theogoniam id est originem deorum interpretatur, tollit omnino usitatas perceptasque cognitiones deorum; neque enim Iovem neque Iunonem neque Vestam neque quemquam qui ita appelletur in deorum habet numero, sed rebus inanimis atque mutis per quandam significationem haec docet tributa nomina.

Zeno's view ... again in his interpretation of Hesiod's *Theogony* (or Origin of the Gods) he does away with the customary and received ideas of the gods altogether, for he does not reckon either Jupiter, Juno or Vesta as gods, or any being that bears a personal name, but teaches that these names have been assigned allegorically to dumb and lifeless things" (transl. H. Rackham).

"What it indicates, is merely that Zeno interpreted (elements of) the *Theogony* of Hesiod and that he did so by claiming that, if we pay attention to what the names of the gods actually mean (*per quandam significationem*), these traditional names can be shown to refer to elements of nature—i.e. what Cicero here for the sake of polemics has labeled *res inanimae atque mutae*. It does certainly not straightforwardly imply that Zeno presented these allegorical or etymological interpretations in the specific context of 'ein fortlaufender Kommentar zur Theogonie Hesiods'".⁴⁵

Algra analyzes seven fragments in which the name of Zeno is in some way associated, either directly or indirectly, with a passage or a figure of Hesiod's *Theogony*, namely *SVF* I 100, 103, 104, 105, 118, 121, 276 (but it should be borne in mind that the texts present in the *SVF* collection may be misleading and should be checked against more recent and more reliable editions). The themes addressed are: the Titans and their names (fr. 100), the conception of Chaos and primordial entities (fr. 103, 104, 105),⁴⁶ the Cyclopes (fr. 118), Helios (fr. 121), the spherical shape of the earth (fr. 276). His enquiry leads to the conclusion that only in a few cases

⁴⁵ Algra (2001) 564–565; the sentence cited at the end is from Steinmetz (1986) 21.

⁴⁶ Zeno believed that the original Chaos was actually water, of which the sediment consolidated in mud was regarded as having given rise to the earth (Gaia).

there is an explicit and precise reference to Hesiod's text (*SVF* I 104 and 105, to which we will return shortly, also adding *SVF* I 235, which Algra does not take into consideration, probably because it concerns the *Works and Days*): "In all other cases *some* connection with Hesiod's text can be made, and it is just plausible to assume that Zeno himself indeed made that connection as well. After all in Zeno's days Hesiod's *Theogony* still provided *the* most authoritative version of mythical cosmogony. Nevertheless ... in a number of cases ... Zeno's comments appear to go beyond what is in Hesiod's text and to focus rather on the traditional world picture, the traditional names and the traditional cosmogony of which Hesiod presents us a poetical version. In this respect it is useful to adduce a general observation made by Anthony Long about the practice of what is usually called 'allegorical interpretation' in the Stoic school. Long rightly points out that 'allegorical interpretation' strictly speaking involves laying bare the hidden intentions of a particular literary author, in this case Hesiod. But this, apparently, is not why Zeno turned to Hesiod. What he interprets is not Hesiod's poem—qua creation of Hesiod—but the hidden meaning of the myths, or of the mythical names, he represents".⁴⁷ Actually, we should maintain a careful distinction between the idea of allegorical interpretation of the mythic content of a literary work and the allegorical interpretation of the myth as such. This is a delicately problematic point, but the two levels should not be confused, nor, much less, should they be identified, however intertwined or indeed overlaid they may come to be in actual practice, because poetry is certainly the major source of myth. And, as is said above, Hesiod's *Theogony* provided *the* most authoritative version of mythical cosmogony.

The title Εἰς Ἡσιόδου Θεογονίαν, which can be read in *SVF* I, p. 71, as a work of Zeno's, is a pure invention by H. von Arnim, which unfortunately has at times been taken up again and occasionally accepted. The careful examination by K. Algra has now put things back in the right perspective. "But if he did not write such a commentary, where then should we suppose him to have discussed these elements of traditional myth? ... The fact that all Zeno's recorded interpretations of myth dealt with cosmological or cosmogonical phenomena, would rather seem to suggest that they originally figured in one of Zeno's physical works ... But what reason do we have to suppose that the references to Hesiodic myth were made in the same context? Here we may adduce another interesting piece

⁴⁷ Algra (2001) 576–577; the reference is to Long (1992), cf. Steinmetz (1986) 29.

of evidence, to be found in Diogenes Laertius X, 27 ... Diogenes, who here professes to report the opinion of Carneades, tells us that both Zeno and Chrysippus, as well as Aristotle, but unlike Epicurus, interspersed their own texts with *marturia* ... Zeno's philosophical works contained many *marturia*, references to poets or to traditional or popular views. The preserved etymological explanations of names of mythical divinities all appear to derive from contexts dealing with cosmogony or cosmology. By contrast, the hypothesis that these etymological explanations stem from an original line-by-line commentary on Hesiod's *Theogony*, lacks support".⁴⁸

I believe that this conclusion can be shared. Furthermore, the utilization and interpretation of passages from authoritative poets belongs to a rich and well established tradition in the sphere of philosophy. It is also worth noting that observations and considerations of relevance for the text itself, including observations of an exegetic nature, could perfectly well find their place in contexts of this type. To our knowledge, Plato and Aristotle represent the first testimony concerning the problem of the lines immediately following the proem, *Th.* 116–120, which constitute the opening part of the Hesiodic cosmogonic exposition.

ἦτοι μὲν πρότιστα Χάος γένετ'· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα 116
 Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
 ἀθανάτων οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
 Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης,
 ἦδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι. 120

In truth, first of all Chasm came to be, and then broad-breasted Earth, the ever immovable seat of all the immortals who possess snowy Olympus' peak and murky Tartarus in the depths of the broad-pathed earth, and Eros, who is the most beautiful among the immortal gods (transl. G. Most).

In Plato, *Symp.* 178b, at the beginning of the development of his argument Phaedrus maintains that Eros is worshipped because he is the most ancient among the gods, as proven by the fact that no-one mentions a genealogy in which he appears. Phaedrus then cites Hesiod's lines on the beginning of the history of the cosmos.

ἀλλ' Ἡσίοδος πρῶτον μὲν Χάος φησὶ γενέσθαι,
 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
 Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
 ἦδ' Ἔρος ...

⁴⁸ Algra (2001) 578–580.

Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ καὶ Ἀκουσίλειος σύμφησιν μετὰ τὸ Χάος δύο τούτῳ γενέσθαι, Γῆν τε καὶ Ἔρωτα.⁴⁹

As Hesiod says:

First Chaos came, and then broad-bosomed Earth,
the everlasting seat of all that is,
and Love ...

and Acusilaus agrees with Hesiod that after Chaos, the Earth and Love, these two, came into being (transl. B. Jowett).

The context guarantees that Plato specifically considered the passage from the *Theogony* as testimony that the original Chaos was followed first by Earth and then by Eros, as the third entity: if the presence or absence of l. 118 is virtually irrelevant for the content of the passage, the absence of l. 119 is crucial for the vision of the primordial phases because it eliminates the Tartarus in the succession of the most ancient beings. The same holds true for Aristotle, *Metaph.* 984b27.

ὑποπεύσειε δ' ἂν τις Ἡσίωδον πρῶτον ζητῆσαι τὸ τοιοῦτον, κἂν εἴ τις ἄλλος ἔρωτα ἢ ἐπιθυμίαν ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν ἔθηκεν ὡς ἀρχήν, οἷον καὶ Παρμενίδης· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος κατασκευάζων τὴν τοῦ παντός γένεσιν “πρώτιστον μὲν” φησιν “ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσατο πάντων”, Ἡσίοδος δὲ

πάντων μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος ...
ἦδ' Ἔρος, ὃς πάντεσσι μεταπρέπει ἀθανάτοισιν,

ὥς δέον ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν ὑπάρχειν τιν' αἰτίαν ἣτις κινήσει καὶ συνάξει τὰ πράγματα.

One might suspect that Hesiod was the first to look for such a thing-or some one else who put love or desire among existing things as a principle, as Parmenides, too, does; for he, in constructing the genesis of the universe, says: “Love first of all the Gods she planned.” And Hesiod says:

First of all things was Chaos made, and then
broad-breasted Earth ...
and Love, 'mid all the gods pre-eminent,

which implies that among existing things there must be from the first a cause which will move things and bring them together (transl. W.D. Ross).

Despite the lack of textual precision, evidently due to citing by heart, here too one finds confirmation of the succession Chaos–Earth–Eros,

⁴⁹ The text is that of Burnet *OCT*. The textual problem involving the sentence Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ καὶ Ἀκουσίλειος σύμφησιν does not affect the problem we are dealing with.

without the Tartarus (and without the formulaic l. 118).⁵⁰ If Plato and Aristotle reflect a Hesiodic text without ll. 118–119—since it is unlikely that they both suffered memory loss at exactly the same point, and even more unlikely that Aristotle depended on Plato, given the differences—it is difficult to say exactly what this really signifies: original text or text with lacuna? In other words, are ll. 118–119 a later interpolation as compared to the original text or were Plato and Aristotle reading a mutilated text from which these lines had disappeared? Can one go so far as to imagine that Plato and Aristotle had a text of the *Theogony* containing ll. 118–119⁵¹ and that they deliberately eliminated these lines because they regarded them as incorrect, placed in the wrong position, or possibly even non authentic? Moreover, the different weight of the two lines cannot be disregarded: what is truly important is actually only the presence or absence of l. 119. Is it conceivable that among the copies of the *Theogony* in circulation there were some with and some without this or these line(s) and that a philosopher considered the version that was more in harmony with his own ideas on cosmology and the origins of the world to be the valid version? If what we are dealing with is a genuine fluctuation in the text, involving the presence or absence of Tartarus at that particular point, then it would be interesting to try to place it within the history of the Hesiodic work and its composition and transmission.⁵²

The use of authoritative figures from the world of thought, like the prestigious poets of the tradition, is a widely recognized characteristic of philosophical discourse: both Plato and Aristotle have extensive recourse to this manner of presenting their arguments. But what is particularly interesting is to note how the debate focusing on a certain passage subsequently became transformed and thereby gave rise to a genuinely philological problem, taking on the distinctive features of the era of the grammarians and the corresponding technical language. Thus with regard to the passage from the *Theogony* which we have discussed here, in sch. *Th.* 117b it is stated that Πλάτων ... ἀθετεῖ τοὺς στίχους (*scil.* ll. 118–119): the debate on the content of the initial lines of the Hesiodic cosmology, taken up again in the commentaries and the exegetic treatises of the Hellenistic age, produced an approach to the problem in terms

⁵⁰ Aristotle also cites the passage from Hesiod in *Phys.* 208b30, but he gives only ll. 116–117.

⁵¹ Which are present in all the manuscripts, including P.Achmim 3 of the 4th–5th century AD: cf. West (1966) *ad loc.*

⁵² Cf. the comm. to these lines in West (1966).

of athetesis, that is to say a deliberate and well motivated intervention on a text that did contain those lines, which were evidently regarded as questionable. Perhaps Zeno too was able to read the Hesiodic lines on the origin of the cosmos without the Tartarus, that is to say without l. 119: the evidence is uncertain but the Stoic philosopher may have directed attention to the problem again along the lines of Plato and Aristotle, in the framework of treatises of a cosmological nature.⁵³

Similarly, for the *Works and Days* the scholia have likewise preserved evidence on Zeno, in connection with ll. 293–295 (SVF I 235):

οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος, ὃς αὐτῷ πάντα νοήσει 293
φρασσάμενος τὰ κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ἦσιν ἀμείνω,
ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ ἀκείνους ὃς εὖ εἰπὼντι πίθηται 295

The man who thinks of everything by himself, considering what will be better, later and in the end—this man is the best of all. That man is fine too, the one who is persuaded by someone who speaks well (transl. G. Most).

Sch. Hes. *Op.* 293–297 οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος; Ζήνων μὲν ὁ Στωϊκὸς ἐνήλλαττε τοὺς στίχους λέγων·

οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος ὃς εὖ εἰπὼντι πίθηται,
ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ ἀκείνους ὃς εὖ εἰπὼντι πίθηται,
τῇ εὐπειθείᾳ τὰ πρωτεῖα διδούς, τῇ φρονήσει δὲ τὰ δευτερεῖα.

This piece of information is confirmed in Diogenes Laertius 7.25–26:

⁵³ The sources are the sch. Hes. *Th.* 117a–b and the sch. Apoll. Rh. 1.496–498b: cf. Algra (2001) 565–569. In the sch. Hes. *Th.* 117a–b (SVF 105), on the basis of the edition by Di Gregorio (1975) 24–25, it seems fairly clear that reference is being made specifically to Zeno's conception of Chaos and to the absence of ll. 118–119 in Plato, *Symp.* 178b, without any apparent connection between the two things. In sch. Apoll. Rh. 1.496–498b (SVF 104) there may be a reference to the fact that even Zeno considered Eros to be the third primordial entity, without the Tartarus of l. 119 (nothing can be said about l. 118), but it remains doubtful whether the citation of Zeno, which started with regard to Chaos, continues with the inclusion of the sentence on Eros: καὶ Ζήνων δὲ τὸ παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ (*Th.* 116 f.) χάος ὕδωρ εἶναι φησι ... τρίτον δὲ ἔξωτα γεγονέναι κατ' Ἡσιόδον (*Th.* 120). Algra (2001) 569: "Given the fact that the scholia were recycled and abbreviated a number of times, it is not impossible that we are dealing with a garbled version of what originally was a reference to a proposal to athetize line 119 on Tartarus, on the ground that both Plato and Zeno ignored Tartarus as a separate factor in their exegesis ... Anyway, given the problems involved in the constitution of the text, and given the fact that there is no clear reason to assume that the scholia here report a suggestion made *on Zeno's part*, the sensible way to proceed would seem to be to limit the testimony on Zeno to the claim about the earth coming from the water". I would reject the idea put forward by West (1966), comm. to 118–119, and West (1967b) 5 n. 1, according to whom Zeno athetized l. 117 (but he uses the old edition of the scholia, without Di Gregorio [1975]).

τούς θ' Ἡσιόδου στίχους μεταγράφειν οὕτω· “κεῖνος μὲν πανάριστος
ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται, / ἔσθλός δ' αὖ καὶ κεῖνος ὃς αὐτὸς πάντα νοήσῃ”.
κρείττονα γὰρ εἶναι τὸν ἀκοῦσαι καλῶς δυνάμενον τὸ λεγόμενον καὶ
χρησθαι αὐτῷ τοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ πᾶν συννοήσαντος· τῷ μὲν γὰρ εἶναι
μόνον τὸ συνεῖναι, τῷ δ' εὖ πεισθέντι προσεῖναι καὶ τὴν πράξιν.

It is said, moreover, that he corrected Hesiod's lines thus: ... The reason he gave for this was that the man capable of giving a proper hearing to what is said and profiting by it was superior to him who discovers everything himself. For the one had merely a right apprehension, the other in obeying good counsel superadded conduct (transl. R.D. Hicks).

I do not think one can imagine a discussion by Zeno concerning a textual problem in the strict sense. The observation clearly derives from a context involving a treatment of ethical themes⁵⁴ and it offers a good illustration of the possibility of inserting the citation of a poet into a philosophical discourse, exploiting it for the purpose of developing the overall argument, e.g. by contending that the poet's words would provide a better meaning and a better teaching if they were interpreted in some particular manner rather than another, or perhaps if they were modified and “corrected” according to a given approach. It is interesting to note that Diogenes speaks of στίχους μεταγράφειν, introducing a verb that had certainly taken on a “technical” philological value, so that he seems to be suggesting a veritable editorial intervention by Zeno,⁵⁵ which seems rather implausible. Thus once again we have a “translation” into philological-grammatical terms of a particular point of a philosophical investigation, in which the passage as well as its interpretation were called into play⁵⁶ (as we saw above for terms such as ἐμβάλλω, διαγράφω, ὀβελίζω, ἀθετέω).

5. “In the field of epic poetry Homer as the author of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and Hesiod as the author of *Theogony* and *Erga* always occupied the first places which Aristotle and his school, followed by Zenodotus and his pupils, had assigned to them”. Thus wrote R. Pfeiffer, in the context of a

⁵⁴ The fragment is placed under the title *Vitae agenda praeepta* in SVF I p. 56: under the same fr. 235 are registered also two references found in Themistius; cf. West (1978) 50–51 and comm. *ad loc.*

⁵⁵ A typical illustration of this is the use made by Aristonicus in sch. *Il.* 2.681a Erbse; other cases can easily be found, for instance by utilizing Erbse's index of the *sermo grammaticus* s.v. μεταγράφειν; cf. Dickey (2007) 206 and 246.

⁵⁶ Some Homeric cases in Montanari (2000a) and Montanari (2008).

survey of the selective lists of authors who formed the object of philological treatment in the culminating period of Alexandrian philology, the era of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus. As Pfeiffer pointed out, there was a major thematic line of investigation that dated back to Aristotle and his school and which continued with the first generations of Alexandrian grammarians.⁵⁷ “Aristotle and his school in the course of their literary researches had occasionally dealt with Hesiodic problems: the relative date of Hesiod and Homer, the authenticity of some of his poems, antiquarian questions. But we know of no edition before that of Zenodotus, who was the first to have the collected manuscripts at his disposal, nor can we tell whether his edition contained other Hesiodic texts besides the *Theogony*. Homer was without a rival; next to him Hesiod was a favourite with the great poets of the first half of the third century, especially with Aratus and Callimachus”.⁵⁸

In effect, it is with Zenodotus that we find the first testimony to refer precisely to an *ekdosis* of Hesiod’s works.⁵⁹ The sch. *Th.* 5 b² cites τὰ Ζηνοδότεια, scil. ἀντίγραφα, with regard to a textual variant.⁶⁰

Περμησοῖο: οἱ μὲν ποταμοὶ τῆς Βοιωτίας οὗτοί εἰσι . . . ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ζηνοδοτέοις γράφεται Τερμησοῖο [κακῶς· ὁ γὰρ Τερμησὸς ὄρος ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ ποταμός].⁶¹

The reading proposed by Zenodotus can be found in several manuscripts: both forms are attested, but Περμ- is predominant and accepted by modern editors.⁶²

The citation of the name Zenodotus in sch. *Th.* 116 c¹ raises a different kind of problems.

⁵⁷ Pfeiffer (1968) 204–205.

⁵⁸ Pfeiffer (1968) 117, cf. p. 177: “The scholar poets of the third century were remarkably fond of Hesiod . . . and their interest stimulated the activity of the grammarians”.

⁵⁹ I explain what I mean by Alexandrian *ekdosis* in Montanari (1998), (2000b), (2002), (2004), (2009).

⁶⁰ Cf. Jacoby (1930) 46; West (1966) 153; Pfeiffer (1968) 117; West (1978) 64; Most (2006) T 134; on Zenodotus, cf. also Martin (2005) 171–174.

⁶¹ The sch. is cited according to Di Gregorio (1975) 4; on the expunged sentence κακῶς—ποταμός: “additamentum videtur indocti hominis qui Termessum a Teumesso non distinxit”. The same sch. preserves a citation of Crates, which is probably spurious: cf. Di Gregorio *ad loc.*; Broggiato (2001) lxvi; West (1966) *ad loc.*

⁶² Cf. West (1966) 153, *ad loc.*, who points out that the initial T- is Attic, in contrast with Π- which is Boeotian.

Χάος γένετ': ... οἱ δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ λέγουσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ τὸν ἀέρα ... ἄλλως.
 χάος λέγει τὸν κεχυμένον ἀέρα· καὶ γὰρ Ζηνόδοτος (οὕτως) φησίν.
 Βακχυλίδης δὲ χάος τὸν ἀέρα ὠνόμαζε, λέγων περὶ τοῦ ἀετοῦ· νωμᾶται
 δ' ἐν ἀτρυγέτῳ χάει (5.26–27 S.-M.).⁶³

After the proem, the account of the cosmogony starts at l. 116 with the primordial Chaos, which was at the origins of the world: this fundamental theme could not have been disregarded by philosophers and the scholia to this line mention a certain number of them.⁶⁴ Zeno had argued that the primordial Chaos was water:⁶⁵ here this opinion is quoted anonymously (οἱ δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ λέγουσιν),⁶⁶ but Zeno is then explicitly cited in the sch. 117a (SVF I 105). Others believed that Chaos was air, and Zenodotus in particular identified Chaos with “τὸν κεχυμένον ἀέρα”, i.e. “the mist shed around”, according to the translation by Pfeiffer, who seems to have no doubt that the scholar cited here is precisely Zenodotus of Ephesus (suggesting that the fragment could derive from his glossary).⁶⁷ In contrast K. Nickau hesitates between Zenodotus of Ephesus and Zenodotus of Alexandria (2nd–1st century BC), to whom the Suda attributes a work Εἰς τὴν Ἡσιόδου Θεογονίαν, perhaps a commentary;⁶⁸ on the other hand, the topic also suggests that one should not exclude Zenodotus of Mallos (2nd–1st century BC), probably to be identified with the Ζηνόδοτος ὁ Κρατήτειος cited in some Homeric scholia and also with the Ζηνόδοτος ὁ Στωϊκός mentioned in Diogenes Laertius 7.30 as a pupil of Diogenes of Babylon.⁶⁹ If Zenodotus of Ephesus put forward an opinion of his own with regard to the Chaos that appears at the beginning of the *Theogony*, then we have to come to the conclusion that the Hesiodic exegesis by the grammarian who was the first “editor” of

⁶³ On the tradition of the text of this sch., see Di Gregorio (1975) *ad loc.*: the mention of Zenodotus is found in a part of the sch. within double square brackets, which the editor uses to indicate portions of text that are preserved by some mss. but which “ab archetypo aliena videntur” (p. xxxi).

⁶⁴ Pp. 22–25 Di Gregorio; cf. West (1966) 192–193, *ad loc.*

⁶⁵ SVF I 103, 104, 105; cf. Algra (2001) 566–569.

⁶⁶ He is probably also the figure referred to in sch. *Th.* 116 c²: χάος παρὰ τὸ χεῖσθαι, cf. SVF I 103 (Ps.-Probus in Verg., *Buc.* VI 31, p. 344, 14–15 Thilo-Hagen): *Zeno Citieus sic interpretatur, aquam χάος appellatam ἀπὸ τοῦ χέεσθαι*.

⁶⁷ Pfeiffer (1968) 117; Nickau (1972) 22, 20 and 40, 34.

⁶⁸ Cf. Nickau (1972) 20–23, esp. 22, 20; this should be the person cited in P.Oxy. 1241 within a group of grammarians who flourished under Ptolemy IX (116–80 BC): cf. Nickau, *ibid.*, 21, 42; Pfeiffer (1968) 254; West (1978) 64 n. 3; Most (2006) T 140, labels the fr. “Zenodotus Alex.”

⁶⁹ Cf. Nickau (1972) 45–47 and 49.

Hesiod encroached on a field which was already being seriously addressed by philosophers, among whom the grammarian's contemporary Zeno. But of course this remains doubtful.

The scanty remains of the work of Apollonius Rhodius on Hesiod certainly do not authorize the hypothesis of a commentary, but they suffice to state that he dealt with this poet far from sporadically.⁷⁰ We saw earlier (§ 3 above) that Apollonius expressed himself in favour of the Hesiodic authenticity of the *Aspis* in the third book (ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ) of a treatise the general subject of which is unknown: one can imagine it may perhaps have been a text on Hesiodic problems that addressed questions of authenticity and other issues, with scattered observations on significant passages, of which we have a couple of fragments.

We already noted (§ 3 above) that the observations by Apollonius and Aristophanes on the *Aspis* imply that they both regarded the *Catalogue* as authentic. This opinion was shared by Crates, as we will see further on. A sch. vet. to the end of the *Works and Days* informs us that Apollonius regarded as spurious the so-called *Ornithomanteia* (of which we do not know the extension), i.e. the part following the existing l. 828, the line that concludes the poem as it has come down to us.

Sch. 828a ... τοῦτοις δὲ ἐπάγουσί τινες τὴν Ὀρνιθομαντείαν (***) ἅτινα Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος (fr. p. 42 Michaelis) ἀθετεῖ.⁷¹

At his point some people add the *Bird Omens*, which Apollonius Rhodius marks as spurious (transl. G. Most).

Perhaps the athetesis of Apollonius, or at least the athetesis he upheld, exerted some influence in later times, since the *Ornithomanteia* has not come down to us, unlike the *Aspis*.

It is not clear exactly what problem Apollonius raised concerning l. 26 of the *Theogony*: ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον.

Sch. 26b ... Ἀπολλώνιος μὲν ὁ Ῥόδιος (fr. 19 Michaelis) λείπειν τὸν πρῶτον στίχον φησὶν· οὐ λείπει δέ, ἀλλ' ἔστι· ποιμένες ἄγραυλοί ἐστε, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες μόνον.

What is meant is not the suspicion of a lacuna after the first line of the Muses' words:⁷² rather, I believe, Apollonius felt that the meaning of the

⁷⁰ On Apollonius and Hesiod cf. West (1966) 50–51 and 162; Pfeiffer (1968) 144; West (1978) 64 and 364; West (1985) 127; Most (2006) T 80 and 135 and p. lxii.

⁷¹ Text of Pertusi, p. 259; on the lacuna cf. *Test. et adn. cr.*, p. 227; cf. Jacoby (1930) 48; West (1978) 364; Most (2006) T 80 and p. lxii; Cingano, this volume, 103f.

⁷² As appears to be assumed by Pfeiffer (1968) 144.

sentence was not complete, and that something was missing (whether he was striving to hypothesize something is of course unknown).⁷³ The anonymous respondent argues that nothing is missing in the meaning, but that the line should simply be interpreted as a nominal phrase, with the verb ἐοτε understood.

We have somewhat more information on Aristophanes of Byzantium.⁷⁴ As we have seen (§ 3 above), he too addressed questions of the authenticity of works attributed to Hesiod. Pfeiffer hypothesizes that he discussed the matter “in his supplement to the *Pinakes* of Callimachus” and this is quite plausible.⁷⁵ We do not know what formed the basis for his belief that the *Precepts of Chiron* was not a work by Hesiod, whereas his doubts concerning the *Aspis* sprang from a careful examination of exemplars of the *Catalogue of Women*, where in book IV he found ll. 1–56 of the *Aspis*, i.e. the Alcmena-*Ehoie* (the mother of Heracles), separately and without the description of Heracles’ shield, which in the *Aspis* is attached to these lines as the major portion of the poem.⁷⁶ This argument clearly presupposes a conviction that the *Catalogue* was by Hesiod. In any case, barring errors, the only ancient evidence against the Hesiodic authorship of this work can be found in the story, related by Pausanias,⁷⁷ according to which the Boeotians living around the Helicon believed that only the *Works and Days* was authentic, and in a passage from Aelian, where the reference to a content of the *Catalogue* is accompanied by an expression of doubt as to its attribution.⁷⁸

For Aristophanes, we owe to sch. *Th.* 68a an important piece of information.

αἱ τὸ τῷ ἴσων· ἐπεσημύνατο ταῦτα ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 405 Slater). νῦν περὶ ἀνόδου αὐτῶν φησι τῆς εἰς τὸν Ὀλυμπόν· ὁ πρότερος γὰρ ἦν λόγος αὐτῷ περὶ τῆς ἐν τόπῳ αὐτῶν χορείας.

⁷³ West 1966, p. 162, *ad loc.*; Di Gregorio (1975) 7, *ad loc.*

⁷⁴ Cf. Jacoby (1930) 46; West (1966) 50–51; Pfeiffer (1968) 177–178; West (1978) 64–65; Aristophanes fr. 405–407 Slater (1986); Most (2006) T 52, 69, 136; the name also appears in sch. *Th.* 126, a passage that gave rise to knotty problems: cf. Di Gregorio *ad loc.*, Slater fr. sp. 439.

⁷⁵ Pfeiffer (1968) 178, cf. West (1978) 64.

⁷⁶ Fr. 406–407 Slater (1986); West (1978) 64, suspects that he also rejected the *Wedding of Ceyx*.

⁷⁷ Paus. 9.31.4–5, cited above, § 2 g 38.

⁷⁸ Ael., *V. H.* 12.36 = fr. 183 M.–W.; concerning the ancient scholarship on the *Catalogue* cf. also Schwartz (1960) 609–618; Arrighetti (1998) 445–447; Hirschberger (2004) 42–43.

We cannot tell what critical *semeion* Aristophanes put at this line and whether its motivation was that indicated in the subsequent part of the scholion, but this is nonetheless sufficient to state that “he must have followed Zenodotus in editing Hesiod”, or at least the *Theogony*.⁷⁹ We will come back to the question of the Hesiodic *semeia* shortly.

It is no doubt purely by chance that we have no specific information on the opinions of Aristarchus with regard to the problems of authenticity that had long been a bone of contention.⁸⁰ As we have already seen (§ 2 above), we only know that he (also on a documentary basis) athetized the proem of the *Works and Days*, but we have no information concerning the proem of the *Theogony*.

As regards the philological activity of Aristarchus concerning Hesiod, we have rather more information. In addition to that concerning the proem of the *Works and Days*, we have another seven certain (plus two conjectural) citations for textual or exegetic problems. Sch. *Th.* 114–115 tells us that the grammarian Seleucus (1st century AD)⁸¹ athetized the two lines, whereas Aristarchus athetized only the second;⁸² Aristarchus also expunged *Op.* 210–211 (sch. *Op.* 207–212, with motivation)⁸³ and *Op.* 740–741 (sch. *Op.* 740a);⁸⁴ in sch. *Th.* 991 his name can be restored conjecturally with regard to a variant.⁸⁵ Exegetic interventions are preserved in sch. *Th.* 76 (προφερεστάτη ἀντὶ τοῦ προεσβυτάτη), sch. *Th.* 138 (οὐ καλῶς τοῦ προεσβυτέρου Οὐρανοῦ θαλεροῦ εἰρημένου), sch. *Th.* 253 (a problem involving the names of the Nereids); according to a proposed correction, the text of sch. *Th.* 379 could be regarded as citing him in

⁷⁹ Pfeiffer (1968) 177, cf. West (1978) 64–65.

⁸⁰ As far as the *Catalogue* is concerned, it is likely that Aristarchus also considered it authentic, following his predecessors Apollonius Rhodius and Aristophanes. In the sch. *Il.* 23.683b Hesiod is defined as more recent than Homer and a reference to the *Catalogue* is attributed to him, indicating that the source must have believed the *Catalogue* to be authentic; however, there is no reliable evidence to say whether this source was Aristarchus himself (West [1985] 127 and n. 3, p. 135), because the relative chronology of the two poets was treated by various authors who deemed Hesiod to be more recent, as can be found in the *Lives* (and elsewhere: see T 5–9 Most [2006] 164–167). In sch. *Th.* 338 and *Op.* 94a it is stated that Hesiod is more recent than Homer and this may effectively be a “doctrine characteristic of Aristarchus” (West [1978] 65 and nn. 6–7), though this remains on the plane of hypothesis.

⁸¹ Fr. 27 Müller (1891); cf. above, § 3 end and n. 40, for the *Aspis*; cf. below, § 6 and n. 102.

⁸² Cf. West (1966) *ad loc.*

⁸³ Cf. West (1978) *ad loc.* and p. 65.

⁸⁴ Pertusi’s integration καὶ τὸν ἔξῃς is necessary: l. 740 cannot be athetized alone.

⁸⁵ Cf. Di Gregorio (1975) *ad loc.*

connection with the adjectivization of the wind Zephyrus.⁸⁶ The EM (539.22) and the EGud (346.46) preserve an observation by Aristarchus on the spelling and accentuation of the name of the Titan Κρ(ε)ῖος, mentioned in *Th.* 134.⁸⁷ In sch. *Op.* 97 we find a response by Aristarchus against the grammarian Comanus of Naucratis on the problem of the Elpis remaining in the *pithos*.⁸⁸ From these data we can reach the conclusion that Aristarchus, continuing the work of his predecessors and maintaining a lively interest in the other great ancient epic poet alongside Homer, made an *ekdosis* of the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* and in all probability also wrote a commentary.⁸⁹ His studies on archaic Greek epic poetry led him, in the wake of his predecessors, to draw a distinction between the Hesiodic and the Homeric style, and to use this distinction as a criterion for evaluating the genuinely Homeric origin of lines with ῥοιόδειος χαρακτήρ. A famous case is that of the list of Nereids in *Il.* 18.39–49 (cf. Did. in sch. *ad loc.*), where in any case the observation and the proposed athetesis already dated back to Zenodotus, but see also the sch. *ad Il.* 24.25–30 (the passage that mentions the judgement of Paris) and the sch. *ad Il.* 24.614–617a. It should also be recalled that Apollonius Rhodius adduced precisely the χαρακτήρ as a reason for the authenticity of the *Aspis*.⁹⁰

As had been the case with Homer, the progress in the editorial activity of the Alexandrian scholars concerning Hesiod was likewise characterized by the use of critical signs. We have no information on Zenodotus, but in actual fact there is no reason why in his *ekdosis* of Hesiod he would not have used the *obelos* he also used for Homer. For Aristophanes of Byzantium a *semeion* is presupposed by sch. *Th.* 68a, as we saw above; for some interventions by Aristarchus concerning the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* one finds in the scholia the verb ὀβερίζω. In the sch. vet. critical signs, without indication of a grammarian's name, are implied by sch. *Th.* 233 (τὸ δὲ σημεῖον παράκειται), 484 (τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι), 927 (διὸ καὶ τὸ σημεῖον); sch. *Op.* 276b (τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι), 649a (σημειοῦται ὁ στί-

⁸⁶ Cf. Di Gregorio (1975) *ad loc.*

⁸⁷ Cf. West (1966) 202; see also Algra (2001) 570–572.

⁸⁸ It is likely that the fragment comes from the polemical Aristarchean work Πρὸς Κομανόν, of which a few fragments of Homeric criticism have been preserved: cf. West (1978) 65; Verdenius (1985) *ad loc.*; Dyck (1988) fr. 16, pp. 251–254; F. Montanari, “Komanos” [1], in: *NP* 6, 1999, 673.

⁸⁹ Cf. Jacoby (1930) 46; Pfeiffer (1968) 220; West (1966) 50–51; West (1978) 65 (see bibliography in n. 2) expresses some doubt: for the issue on Aristonicus see below, n. 94; Most (2006) T 49 and 137.

⁹⁰ See above in § 3; cf. Schwartz (1960) 43–46.

χος οὔτος).⁹¹ All this must have been transmitted through the work of the grammarian Aristonicus (cited for a reading in sch. *Th.* 178) entitled *Περὶ τῶν σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ Ἡσιόδου*⁹² and therefore it must go back to Aristarchus. There is no evidence for a similar treatise on the *Works and Days*, but the assumption that it must have existed seems to me plausible. In the *Etymologicon* of Orion (96.28–29 Sturz) we find the citation Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν τοῖς σημείοις Ἡσιόδου: this is a most curious way of citing a commentary, but the expression becomes meaningful if one imagines there may have been a mistake in the author's name for Ἀριστόνικος (wrong interpretation of an abbreviation?). A remarkable piece of evidence of this tradition is P.Oxy. 3224, a small fragment of an exemplar of the *Works and Days* of the 2nd century AD, which presents a left-hand margin that is extremely rich in *semeia*: in just a few lines we have the *obelos*, the *diple*, the *asteriskos* and probably the *chi*.⁹³

The work by Aristonicus on the Hesiodic critical signs of Aristarchus⁹⁴ charts a path that is exactly parallel to the well-known history of Homeric critical signs, although the documentation is far less rich, and naturally for Hesiod we have neither a *Ven. A* codex nor a corpus of scholia comparable to that existing for Homer.⁹⁵ For the other great erudite figure of the Augustan age, namely Didymus, we know even less than we do for Aristonicus. We may perhaps, for Didymus too, go as far as to hypothesize that in the case of Hesiod he played a role and a function parallel to his known role for Homer, acting as the scholar who conserved the philological heritage of the Hellenistic age and transmitted

⁹¹ West (1978) 65 n. 4 mentions another four scholia beginning with τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι, which are present in only one ms. but absent in the edition by Di Gregorio (1975).

⁹² Suid. s.v. Aristonikos (α 3924); cf. L. Cohn, "Aristonikos" 17, in: *RE* II 1, 1895, 966; Pfeiffer (1968) 220 and n. 3; West (1978) 65; F. Montanari, "Aristonikos" [5], in: *NP* 1, 1996, 1120.

⁹³ Edition by D. Obbink in *P.Oxy.* XLV, 1977, pp. 51–52. An overview of Hesiodic exegesis preserved in the papyri can be found in Stroppa (2008): while maintaining the due caution called for by the chance nature of the discoveries, we can certainly say that the remains of exegetic material on Hesiod preserved in the papyri are rather scanty, especially if compared to Homer; none of the preserved fragments can be attributed with certainty to a commentary and P.Oxy. 3224 is probably the most significant piece of evidence.

⁹⁴ Cf. Jacoby (1930) 46–47; Pfeiffer (1968) 220 n. 3; Most (2006) T 142. I am surprised to find the statement in West (1978) 65, that "If Aristarchus had left his own commentary, there would have been no need for Aristonicus": this hardly strikes me as a reason for doubting the existence of an Aristarchean commentary, as shown by the parallel Homeric example (cf. above, n. 89).

⁹⁵ On the corpus of the Hesiodic scholia, see the recent overview by Dickey (2007) 40–42.

the scholarship of Aristarchus, but the two scanty shreds of exegetic remains that we have allow us little more than a plausible hypothesis. The remains in question are sch. *Th.* 126 and sch. *Op.* 304b.⁹⁶

A subject touched on earlier (§ 2 above) is the Hesiodic exegesis of Crates of Mallos, whom we mentioned in connection with the athetesis of the proems of the *Theogony* and of the *Works and Days*. We have another three fragments of Crates concerning Hesiod, which deal with exegetic and textual problems. There is no certainty that Crates did indeed write commentaries on Hesiod, but the insight offered by his remarks and the specific problem of text criticism on *Op.* 530 seem to point in this direction. But what is certain is that in turning his attention to Hesiod, Crates was working in the wake of a Stoic tradition that was interested in themes of a cosmological and religious nature,⁹⁷ which in the exegetic material that has come down to us is well testified by the citations of Zeno (cf. § 4 above) and of Chrysippus.

Sch. *Th.* 126 preserves an observation on a cosmological theme, in which Crates is said to have found in Hesiod the concept that the earth and the sky are spherical. It is stated in *Th.* 126–127 that Earth generated Uranos equal to herself so that he would cover her completely, but Crates said that the earth cannot be “equal” (l. 126: ἴσον) to the sky: ἀλλ’ ὁ Κράτης ἀπορεῖ· εἰ γὰρ ἴσον, πῶς δύναται καλύπτειν? Such a difficulty can be comprehended only in terms of a spherical conception, which would require that the sky covering the earth is more extended. In the subsequent part of the scholion the solution of the difficulty, evidently put forward by Crates himself, is to say that “equal” should be understood in the sense of the spherical shape and not in terms of extension.⁹⁸

In *Th.* 142–143 it is stated that the Cyclopes were similar to the gods, except for the fact of having only one eye. The scholion to l. 142 says that Crates noted a contradiction with the section of the *Catalogue* which relates that the Cyclopes were killed by Apollo, and therefore they could not be equal to the gods, i.e. immortal (fr. 52 M.-W.). Crates untangled this contradiction by replacing l. 142 with another line, which claimed that the Cyclopes were human, but that they were brought up by the gods. The predominant opinion is that the replacement line is the work

⁹⁶ Schmidt (1854) 299–300, cf. p. 12; West (1966) 51 and 69; West (1978) 66 and 233 (comm. to v. 304); Most (2006) T 143.

⁹⁷ Broggiato (2001) xxiii, F 78–81, pp. 78–80, comm. pp. 239–241; cf. Jacoby (1930) 46; Pfeiffer (1968) 241; Most (2006) T 139.

⁹⁸ F 79 Broggiato (2001) with comm.

of Crates himself and does not derive from a different version of the *Theogony*.⁹⁹ This line of reasoning presupposed that Crates, like Apollonius Rhodius and Aristophanes before him, believed the *Catalogue* to be by Hesiod.

Sch. *Op.* 529–531 (from Proclus) and the EGen AB = EM 594.46 state that in l. 130, in the description of winter, instead of μυλιδόντες “gritting their teeth”, Crates actually wrote (γράφει: a conjecture?) μαλκιδόντες “stiff with cold” (from μαλκιάω, normally μαλκίω).¹⁰⁰

6. Other sporadic evidence of Hesiodic exegesis testifies to a constant interest at various levels, of which only few fragments have survived. Of Dionysius Thrax, a pupil of Aristarchus, we have a gloss on the word φερέοικος in *Op.* 571, that has come down to us in the scholion of Proclus,¹⁰¹ but information as to the type of work from which this derived is totally lacking; for Demetrius Ixion (today dated in all probability to the 2nd century BC) the *Suda* preserves the title Εἰς Ἡσίοδον ἐξηγήσεις.¹⁰² We have already encountered Seleucus (1st century AD), one of the grammarians most frequently cited in the Hesiodic scholia (sch. *Th.* 114–115, 160, 270, 573; sch. *Op.* 96a, 150b 549; sch. *Sc.* 415) for athetesis and textual variants:¹⁰³ it would appear that he was concerned with the *Theogony*, the *Works and Days* and the *Shield*, perhaps producing editions and commentaries; he may possibly have played an important role in the transmission of Alexandrian exegetic materials. Mention has also already been made of the *hypomnema* to the *Aspis* by his contemporary Epaphroditus (1st century AD).¹⁰⁴ Other 1st century AD grammarians cited in the *scholia vetera* are Tryphon and Habron (both in sch. *Th.* 389).

Plutarch devoted much attention to Hesiod and wrote a major commentary on the *Works and Days*, which certainly preserved information on the previous Hesiodic studies. Proclus used it and a number of fragments have thereby been preserved in the scholia.¹⁰⁵ During the

⁹⁹ F 80 Broggiato (2001) with comm. and bibliographic references; cf. West (1966) *ad loc.*

¹⁰⁰ F 81 Broggiato (2001) with comm.; cf. West (1978) *ad loc.*

¹⁰¹ Sch. *Op.* 571–577, p. 186, 5–6 Pertusi: cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 267; West (1978) 66; L. Pagani, “Dionysius [14] Thrax”, in: *LGGA* (2008).

¹⁰² P. Ascheri, “Demetrius [14] Ixion”, in: *LGGA* (2006); Most (2006) T 141.

¹⁰³ §§ 3 and 5 above: cf. West (1978) 66–67; fr. in Müller (1891); Most (2006) T 144.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. above, § 3 and n. 40; Most (2006) T 145. For the imperial age, cf. Jacoby (1930) 47.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. § 1 above; Maes (1939); West (1978) 67–68; Most (2006) lxix and T 147; on the commentaries of the Byzantine age (Proclus, John Tzetzes, Planudes, Moschopoulos), see West (1978) 68–75. Proclus: Marzillo (2009); Moschopoulos: Grandolini (1991).

imperial age, Hesiod's style was the object of interest and analysis by a number of rhetoricians and literary critics.¹⁰⁶

As we have seen, problems of authenticity and selection within a fairly wide-ranging and considerably variegated corpus were frequently discussed during the Alexandrian age, following a long path strongly similar to that which for Homer, as far as we know, dates back at least to Herodotus (who in 2.117 adduced content-based arguments to claim that the *Cypria* is not by Homer), and which led to restricting the authentically Homeric works to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Margites*. Of the two major works forming the object of discussion, the *Aspis* has been preserved in the mss., while the *Catalogue* is lost, even though the numerous papyri testify to its fortune during the imperial age, in addition to the triad consisting of the *Theogony*, the *Works and Days* and the *Shield*.¹⁰⁷

We will conclude with a brief remark on the *scholia vetera* that have come down to us. The roots of the corpus very probably can be traced back to a commentary (or possibly more than one, combined at a later period) of the early imperial age, given that no citations of grammarians beyond the time of Tryphon and Habron (1st century AD) are found. The commentary was a repository of the many streams of the scholarship of the Hellenistic age (above all, but not exclusively, Alexandrian) and of the philosophical interpretations deriving chiefly from the Stoics. As usual and in accordance with general practice, the commentary was epitomized, abridged, altered in the manuscripts in which it was transmitted in the form of marginal annotations; moreover the resulting corpus itself was then further enriched over time with new materials of later origin, namely paraphrases and other contributions by Byzantine erudite scholars. Since Hesiodic scholarship began fairly early, at least with Aristotle, in the *scholia vetera* one finds fragments of respectable antiquity, citations of the grammarians touched on in this paper, references to philosophers such as Zeno and Chrysippus.¹⁰⁸ This fragmentary evidence allows us a glimpse of the rich array of critical-exegetical achievements, the intellectual products of which have for the most part been lost: it is the rise and development of this heritage that we have sought to bring to light in these pages.

¹⁰⁶ See R. Hunter, this volume.

¹⁰⁷ On the problems of the Hesiodic corpus, see E. Cingano, this volume.

¹⁰⁸ The essentials in West (1966) 69–70; West (1978) 67–68; Dickey (2007) 40.

THE LATIN RECEPTION OF HESIOD*

GIANPIERO ROSATI

1. *A man without a myth, or the poet of prose*

Even if the first explicit mention of Hesiod in Latin goes back no further than the age of Caesar, the poet from Ascrea must have represented an important reference point in the panorama of emerging Latin literature ever since the archaic age.¹ A sure trace of the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* (vv. 60 and above all 76) has long been indicated in a fragment of the epic by Naevius (according to many commentators, the *incipit* of the poem), in the definition of the Muses (*novem Iovis concordēs filiae sorores*, 1 M.);² and the very form of this allusion by Naevius presupposes a familiarity with a great classic of the archaic Greek age, on a par with Homer.

In Latin literature, as in that of Greece,³ Hesiod may be said to appear together with Homer, a figure from whom he seems to find difficulty in breaking free in order to acquire an autonomous identity and profile (their mention together, as an inseparable couple, is quite frequent: Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.3 and 98; *Nat. deor.* 1.41; Ovid, *Ars* 2.4; Seneca, *Ben.* 1.3.10; *Epist.* 27.6; Statius, *Silv.* 5.3.26 and 150–151; etc.). That is to say, Hesiod seems to be defined as the “non-Homer”, as if his identity had to be defined mainly “by opposition” to the figure of the greater poet, whose imposing presence occupies the reference panorama of Latin men of

* For comments and suggestions I thank E. Magnelli and M. Telò.

¹ The lack of an overview of the presence of Hesiod in Latin literature and culture is a serious gap in scholarship, which hinders both an overall vision of the poet's fortunes, and an adequate knowledge of his wide-ranging, capillary presence in the cultural history of Rome. Rare, unimportant references to Latin literature are also to be found in Wolbergs (1988), which is largely dedicated to Hesiod's *Nachleben*, but which is useful, on the contrary, for Christian culture. Good partial contributions are La Penna (1962) (and [1985]); Pontani (2000); Hardie (2005). A series of pointed echoes of Hesiod in Latin authors can be found in the apparatus of Rzach (1902); some integrations are offered in West (1969) and (1986).

² Cf. Mariotti (2001) 51–54.

³ On the fortune of Hesiod in Greek literature, cf. at least Buzio (1938); Reinsch-Werner (1976); Fakas (2001); Petrakis (2003); Musäus (2004).

letters in the archaic age. The idea of a dichotomy, of a “natural” opposition, which easily turns into competition, between Homer and Hesiod, an idea which is already crystallised as the basis of the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, must have been extremely ancient,⁴ and it persists tenaciously through the course of the centuries (continuing to provoke intolerance in Plutarch, *Quaest. Conviv.* 675 A). We know that the problem of the relative dating of the two poets,⁵ for example, was the subject of a philological discussion in Rome, in the *Didascalica* by Accius,⁶ who assigned the chronological primacy (probably linked with a high degree of authority and prestige) to Hesiod, with whose text the Latin poet was evidently familiar. The same familiarity was demonstrated also by the contemporary annalist Cassius Emina (fr. 8 P.), who was likewise interested in discussing a question which, in the following centuries, was to occupy the philological skills of the great antiquarian Varro (fr. 68 Funaioli),⁷ as well as Cicero himself (*Cato* 54) and Seneca (*Epist.* 88.6),⁸ and to inspire the debates of the learned circles of the imperial age, of which Aulus Gellius informs us (3.11, 17.21).⁹

However, the figure of archaic Latin literature in whom the presence of Hesiod, together with the dominant figure of Homer, can be concretely seen playing a fundamental role is that of Ennius. While on the one hand Ennius, by introducing the heroic hexameter to Rome, presents himself as the natural heir and continuator of Homer (undoubtedly more so than Livius Andronicus), and as the *alter Homerus*, so defined by critics in the period of Horace (*Serm.* 2.1.50–51),¹⁰ on the other hand Ennius is,

⁴ On the antiquity of the tradition, which probably goes back to the rhetor Alcidas, and finally found expression in the extant text of the *Certamen*, which is of the period of Hadrian, and in general on its characteristics, cf. Rosen (1997) 474.

⁵ On this question, cf. Graziosi (2002) 100–110 and Musäus (2004) 74–94.

⁶ Degl’Innocenti Pierini (1980) 58–59, who also points out a possible trace of Hesiod’s text in Accius (cf. also p. 121; on possible relationships with the *Scutum*, p. 25). It is clear that the very title, *Didascalica*, evokes a connection with the archegete of the poetic genre, especially if, as has been suggested (Pöhlmann [1973] 848, on the basis of fr. 13 M.), the work contemplated a teacher and a learner.

⁷ He was interested in Hesiod both as an *auctor* of agriculture (*Res rust.* 1.1.9) and for his etymological speculations (*Ling. Lat.* 5.20.3 *a chao cavo caelum*; cf. also Paul. Fest. 45 L.).

⁸ On the presence of Hesiod in Seneca, cf. Mazzoli (1970) 165–168; Setaioli (1988) 66–68.

⁹ On Hesiod in Gellius, who calls him *poetarum prudentissimus*, cf. Holford-Strevens (1988) 171–172.

¹⁰ Furthermore, on the presence of Hesiod also in the strictly epic Ennius, cf. at least Häußler (1976) 161–162, 172–178.

like Hesiod, an epic poet whose hexametric poetry encompasses themes belonging to less prestigious genres, which are sometimes quite distant from the heroic dimension. Hesiod is therefore a poet who identifies much less than Homer with a single literary genre, the epic, of which Homer is clearly the leading representative and the paradigm, but constitutes a reference point in a much wider, more complex framework. In particular, while the philosophical character of works such as *Epicharmus*, *Euhemerus* and above all *Protrepticus* might reveal obvious affinities with the didactic genre of the *Works and Days*, the cosmogonic speculations of a Pythagorean character present in *Epicharmus*, like the theories about the origin of the gods at the basis of *Euhemerus*, must inevitably have found their reference in the *Theogony*. What connects Ennius with Hesiod (and not with Homer) is the “technical-professional” character of their production, which makes them intellectual models and sources of a knowledge that is not just “philosophical-sapiential” but more varied, with a technical-practical touch (whether the subject is the construction of a plough or the preparation of a cooking recipe).¹¹

Secondly, for Ennius Hesiod is the model (via Callimachus) for his poetic initiation as the new Homer. In the proem of his most ambitious work, the *Annales*, the poet relates that the ghost of Homer appeared to him in a dream, telling him that he had been reincarnated in him, and that, as a result, he was an *alter Homerus*. While it is clear, on the one hand, that becoming the Latin Homer is the main ambition to which Ennius lays claim in his dispute with his unrefined predecessors, it is equally significant that the form that this claim assumes is plainly Hesiodic. The meeting of the poet with the Muses narrated in the proem of the *Theogony* had been imitated by Callimachus in the *Aitia* and inserted into the frame of a dream,¹² and this pattern was to become extremely common in Latin poetry; indeed, it was to become the typical pattern for poetic initiation (a stereotype that became dominant partly thanks to its use by poets like Gallus and Propertius, and the abuse of which was to provoke the sarcastic reaction of Persius in his

¹¹ On *Hedyphagetica* in relationship to the didactic tradition, cf. Bettini (1979) 62–65, 67 (who recalls that Athenaeus 310 A defined Archestratus, the model of Ennius, as the Hesiod of gastronomy).

¹² A correction of the model (followed by Latin “imitators” of Ennius) which has been interpreted as a desire to make the fantastic meeting with the Muses in the *Theogony* rationally credible: cf. Pretagostini (1995) 170–172. In a word, as if the desire was to refuse the most Homeric, anti-realistic component of Hesiod’s poetry.

choliambi).¹³ In a highly skilful literary operation, Ennius reconciles and combines his two great archaic Greek models, but also the Hellenistic mediation through which they are to be received: in this way, he appropriates the entire Greek poetic tradition.¹⁴ The cultural awareness that emerges from this allusive gesture¹⁵ also indicates the extent of his desire to mark out, in this way, a new beginning for the young Latin literature, relegating the early clumsy versifiers to the background (by means of a return to the origins of Greek literature), and the centrality of Hesiod in this operation. Hesiod, above all, contributes the subjective, autobiographical element, which—with a significant detachment from the impersonal Homeric “objectivity”, celebrated ever since Aristotle—brings to the foreground the personality of the poet,¹⁶ who discusses problems of a literary character, engages in personal polemics and enunciates moral principles. In this respect too, therefore, Ennius proves to be the heir of the Hellenistic poets who had found in Hesiod an expression of the conscience of their own tradition, but also literary forms and models that were alternatives to the heroic epos as a way out of this condition.

Compared with a Homer who is *ingenium sine exemplo maximum*, the only one worthy of the title of poet (Vell. 1.5.1), Hesiod, we might say, is the “poet of prose”, the man with the refined talent whose verses are smooth and sweet (a sweetness that was attributed to him in a well-known epigram by Callimachus, 27.2), a lover of peace, whose prestige is only slightly lower than that of the mythical, “divine” Homer: this is how he is represented in the elegant definition of a historian of the age of Augustus and Tiberius, Velleius Paterculus:¹⁷

Huius temporis aequalis Hesiodus fuit, circa CXX annos distinctus ab Homeri aetate, vir perelegantis ingenii et mollissima dulcedine carminum memorabilis, otii quietisque cupidissimus, ut tempore tanto viro, ita operis auctoritate proximus (1.7.1).¹⁸

¹³ An ample discussion can be found, after Kambylis (1965), in Suerbaum (1968) 46–113; more recently cf. Canobbio (2006).

¹⁴ Cf. Hunter (2006) 15.

¹⁵ A combined appropriation of models which anticipates the one which (albeit in different works) Virgil performs. While in the *Aeneid* he becomes the Latin Homer, in the *Georgics* he adopts the didactic genre which, in its Hellenistic development, had established the primacy of Hesiod as the master of wisdom.

¹⁶ Cf. e.g. Judet de la Combe (1993); Most (1993).

¹⁷ The English translations, unless otherwise indicated, are from Most (2006), (2007).

¹⁸ Cf. Schmitzer (2000) 80. The immediately following affirmation of the difference in the dispute about the homeland of the two poets (*Qui vitavit ne in id quod Homerus incideret, patriamque et parentes testatus est, sed patriam, quia multatus ab ea erat,*

At this time [i.e. 820 BC] lived Hesiod, who differed in age from Homer by about 120 years, a man of extremely refined talent and renowned for the extraordinarily gentle sweetness of his poems, greatly desirous of peace and quiet, second to such a great man (i.e. Homer) both in time and in the prestige of his work.

This characterisation must have become practically canonical, seeing that we find it substantially shared by a prince of literary criticism like Quintilian: while Homer, for him, is the matchless paradigm of the “sublime” (*hunc nemo in magnis rebus sublimitate ... superaverit*, Quintilian 10.1.46), Hesiod is the poet with the “unremarkable” tone, who is appreciated (in spite of the technical character of his works) thanks to the pleasant mood he creates and the usefulness of his teachings:

Raro adsurgit Hesiodus magnaue pars eius in nominibus est occupata, tamen utiles circa praecepta sententiae, levitasque verborum et compositionis probabilis, daturque ei palma in illo medio genere dicendi (10.1.52).

Hesiod rarely rises to heights, and much of his work is filled with proper names; however, his moral maxims are useful, the smoothness of his vocabulary and composition deserve praise, and he wins the palm in the middle style.
(transl. Russell)

Compared with Homer, the man-myth and the source of all poetry, Hesiod is the man without a myth, the poet of a peaceful life lived in an everyday, anti-heroic dimension (which explains the approval that he received from Hellenistic poetry);¹⁹ he is the poet who does not reach the topmost peaks of poetry (even if he represents the archetype of the poet initiated by the Muses), but is the best expression of the medium level of style, and is above all a source of wisdom and precepts that are useful for common people. In the comparison with Homer, just as the latter is identified with the *Iliad*, and its warlike, aristocratic ethos, Hesiod is associated with the *Works and Days*, the poem about pacific, working activities, which expresses the quintessence of his poetry: an identification shared by Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1033–1044) and widespread in Greek culture.²⁰

contumeliosissime) seems to go back to the same tradition presupposed in the opening words of the *Certamen*. Also Ovid, *Pont.* 4.14.31–34 goes back to the tradition regarding the criticism of Ascia by its most famous citizen.

¹⁹ As regards the Hesiodic connection, taken up by Hellenistic and Latin poetry, between the didactic genre and simple folk as the subject and addressee (in literary fiction) of the poet-teacher, cf. Fakas 2001, 100–103.

²⁰ Cf. Graziosi (2002) 175–180.

2. *The two Hesiods*

A significant trace of the opposition with Homer as a pattern which serves to characterise the different ethos of the two authors can be found in a famous passage by Dio Chrysostom (*Orat.* 2.7 ff.), containing a dialogue between the young Alexander and his father, Philip. Alexander states that his passion is exclusively for Homer and considers “the heroes and demigods his examples” (7), and Philip asks him to express a judgement about Hesiod: Alexander replies that he certainly considers him a worthy poet, but “not for kings and generals”, but rather “for shepherds, carpenters, and farmers” (8), to whom he offered useful advice, in particular in a period when they “lived a slave’s life, herding and farming for Illyrians and Triballians” (9). When his father objects that all the same, Hesiod defeated Homer in the well-known competition, Alexander answers that his victory was quite right, “because he was not exhibiting his skill before kings, but before farmers and plain folk, or, rather, before men who were lovers of pleasure and effeminate” (12). And, Alexander went on, that Hesiod himself was aware that he was inferior to Homer is shown by the fact that “while Homer wrote of heroes, he composed a Catalogue of Fair Women, and in reality made the women’s quarters the subject of his song, yielding to Homer the eulogy of men” (14) (transl. Cohoon).

This passage makes reference to a series of themes (Hesiod as the poet of useful teachings, the poet of common people, of peace, of women) which, as has been said above, date back to a critical vulgate that is much more ancient than Dio, and which may be seen to be significant in the Latin reception of Hesiod. On the other hand, this widespread procedure of conceptualising Hesiod by means of a comparison with Homer provides a point of closer contact between the judgement of Alexander-Dio and that of Quintilian, and highlights one of the characteristics that ensure for Hesiod a paradigmatic role in the panorama of classical literature. To put it in the epigrammatic form used by Nietzsche, “Lügendesang ist homerisch, Wahrsang hesiodeisch”:²¹ that is to say, again in opposition to Homer and his poetic universe constructed around the world of myth and heroes, Hesiod, the poet of the useful advice for common people, becomes the representative of a poetry linked to concrete, everyday

²¹ I quote from Stroh (1976) 86.

reality.²² And the idea of “truth” as the subject of Hesiod’s poetry brings with it, almost as a natural complement, that of an appropriate addressee, that is to say, the common man interested in acquiring a knowledge that will be of value for himself and his requirements.

The fact that the opposition is in itself arbitrary and partial is not an important point for us: it is clear that it is based on a polarity between the *Iliad* and the *Works and Days*, and that excluding the *Theogony* means leaving out a crucial aspect of Hesiod’s poetry. And yet this is exactly what happens, a selection that absolutizes the *Works and Days* as the poem that symbolises Hesiod. It is clear that the image of Hesiod as the archetype of the poet who is the master of truth is constructed on the basis of the well-known programmatic verse 10 of the proem of the *Works and Days* (“proclaim truths to Perses”); in the same way, in the opposite sense, the proem of the *Theogony*, with its scene in which the poet is invested by the Muses, presents him as a witness–teacher of a “revealed” truth. So while, in opposition to Homer, Hesiod may be defined *tout court* as the “poet of truth” (in his identification with the *Works and Days*), it is also true that as the author of the *Theogony*, Hesiod may appear to be a different poet, whose production includes that element of fiction which links him with his anti-model, Homer. That is to say, a dichotomy is created between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, on the basis of the two different kinds of epic (mythological and didactic, respectively) that the two main poems of Hesiod’s corpus represent, making him intrinsically a “double” poet.²³

This double nature of Hesiod emerges, for example, in a well-known passage by Ovid, the proem of the *Ars amatoria* (1.27–30), where the poet reassures the reader-learner about the effectiveness of his teaching:²⁴

*Nec mihi sunt visae Clio Cliusque sorores
servanti pecudes vallibus, Ascra, tuis:
usus opus movet hoc: vati parete perito;
vera canam: coeptis, mater Amoris, ades!*

²² On this line of interpretation (based on an *Iliad* vs *Works and Days* opposition) that is shared by an important sector of modern criticism, cf. Strohm (1976) 93–94.

²³ As should be evident, unlike some scholars (as e.g. Farrell [1991] 28–33) I use the tag “the two Hesiods” not to differentiate the archaic poet from his Hellenistic image, but to catch the intimate duality of his production.

²⁴ An ample discussion is to be found in La Penna (1979); further references in Volk (2002) 161 n. 10.

Neither did Clio and Clio's sisters appear to me while I kept flocks in thy vale, O Ascra: experience inspires this work: give ear to an experienced bard; true will be my song: favour my enterprise, O mother of Love.

(transl. Mozley)

While the reference to the initiation scene makes Hesiod the paradigm of a fictitious form of poetry that is inspired from elsewhere, and thus far removed from reality and utility, on the other hand the claim that "truth" is the object of the useful teaching that the poet guarantees finds its archetype in the programme of saying "true things" found at the opening of Hesiod's didactic poem.²⁵ Thus Hesiod may serve both as the model of a poetry of truth and as that of an "inspired", and thus potentially false, poetry, in line with the claim of the Muses themselves that they are capable of saying "many false things similar to genuine ones" (*Th.* 27).²⁶

Thus the characteristic on which the opposition with Homer was based disappears, and the polarisation is found within the works of Hesiod himself, between his two great poems: on the one hand, the theological erudition presented in the *Theogony* (and in the *Catalogue* associated with it), revealed from elsewhere and unverifiable on the basis of concrete experience, far removed from the dimension of common mortals (in other words, a kind of poetry very similar to that of Homer); on the other, the practical knowledge and the patrimony of morality that the *Works and Days* transmit to their humble addressee. While the poet of the *Theogony* declares that he is called by the Muses to sing of "the race of the blessed ones who always are" (vv. 31–33), the same poet, in his proem of the *Works and Days*, declares his intention to "proclaim truths to Perses" (v. 10), in contrast with the Muses' capacity for "glorifying in songs" (that is to say, celebrating great men). His programmatic affirmation makes an opposition between a kind of poetry that has as its object, and its addressees, famous men, and another, different kind of poetry, more modest and concrete, linked with everyday domestic reality. The kind that wins him the approval of Hellenistic poetry, and which, with its "need for truth", could offer an authoritative precedent for the Callimachean principle of ἀμάστυγον οὐδὲν αἰίδω.²⁷

²⁵ Cf. Hollis (1977) *ad loc.*

²⁶ Barchiesi (1994) 171–174.

²⁷ The fact that this claim is intrinsically ambiguous and leaves space for the rejected myth and for the display of a doctrine about the tradition of which it is a part, is quite another question; on this point, cf. Fakas (2001) 165–168.

The choice of a new kind of “useful” poetry (or one which might appear to be such, in opposition to the heroic epic of the Homeric kind) thus allows us to trace back ultimately to Hesiod, as the master of truth, the anti-mythological tradition which, at least from Lucilius (587 M. = 604 K.) to Lucretius (5.878–915; 4.732–740), Martial (10.4; 5.53), and Juvenal (1.5–13, 52–54), maintains a significant presence in Latin literature and at the same time polemically attacks as its main target, rather than Homer, those mythological fantasies which take their origin from the *Theogony* (Chimaeras, Giants, Gorgons, Harpies, Erinnyes, Typhoeus and hundred-handed monsters, etc.). This is what happens, for example, when Manilius (who lived under Augustus or Tiberius), in the proem of the third book of his poem, confirms his innovative programme of scientific truth (*veras percipe voces*, 3.37), and starts his catalogue of themes that are rejected because they are subjects of mythological fiction that have been abused, not with Homer’s Trojan wars (vv. 7–8), but with the Wars of the Titans and the Giants, which is a clear reference to the *Theogony*, the basic text of the whole mythographical tradition (vv. 5–6):

*non ego in excidium caeli nascentia bella,
fulminis et flammis partus in matre sepultos ...*²⁸

I shall not tell of war conceived for heaven’s destruction and offspring buried by the flames of the thunderbolt in its mother’s womb.

(transl. Goold)

Similarly Ovid, following in the wake of Lucretius, several times includes in lists of *prodigiosa ... veterum mendacia vatum* (*Am.* 3.6.17) a series of mythological figures such as the Gorgons, Pegasus, the Chimaera, Cerberus, the Sphinx, the Harpies, the Giants and hundred-handed monsters (*Trist.* 4.7.11–18; *Am.* 3.12.21–40; etc.), whose origins and best-known descriptions were often to be found in the text of the *Theogony*. Thus the *Theogony* acts as a paradigm of mythological fiction, abstract poetry in contrast with a poetic programme whose aim is to speak about concrete everyday reality, a programme which ultimately goes back to the other poem by Hesiod, the *Works and Days*: the two Hesiods are thus implicitly opposed to each other, in this way revealing the double nature of his poetry, with its influence on Hellenistic poetry in both directions.

²⁸ It is also worth noting that the poet of *Aetna*, in enunciating the programme of a modern scientific poetry in opposition to the mythological fables of the past, indicates a Hesiodic myth as the first example of *iactata fabula*, although this time it is taken from the *Works and Days*, that is to say, the golden age (9 ff.): *aurea securi quis nescit saecula regis ...* Another trace of Hesiod in *Aetna* is pointed out by West (1969) 4.

Furthermore, this is a programme in which the precedent of the Hellenistic lesson can be recognised, of the same Theocritus who had indicated the Hesiod of the *Theogony* as an example to be avoided, the model of the poet far removed from the human world, to whom the bucolic poet opposes the choice of a human, concrete subject, undoubtedly more suitable for his encomiastic compositions.²⁹ But in this field too, the same Hesiod who was on the one hand rejected, on the other offered alternative possibilities. Whereas the *Theogony* might link Hesiod with the Homeric type of mythological poetry, Hesiod himself could offer an escape from the traditionalism of the heroic epic, because while he could be proposed as a model, in general, for Hellenistic poetry, both for a “realistic” kind of poetry and for learned poetry anchored in tradition (two tendencies that could be united, for example, in the taste for aetiology), Hesiod could also act as a paradigm of the relationship with power, and of the political function of poetry. The dialogue between poetry and royalty had been one of the central aspects of Hesiod’s ideology (*Th.* 80–103), and could offer, as it already had for men of letters at the Hellenistic courts, a reference framework for poets and intellectuals who sought the protection of power in Rome, and negotiated their own role in its service: in the case of encomiastic poetry too, as we shall see, Hesiod was a prestigious model of a “discourse on power and poets”, to be maintained as a reference point.

Depending on the circumstances, therefore, Hesiod can represent the mythologist-poet, the originator and the paradigm (together with, and even more so than Homer) of a tradition of fiction, and at the same time the master-poet of truth, who is opposed to that tradition, possessing a varied, universal knowledge, and is also a model of alternative literary genres and forms.

3. *The poet of wisdom*

While Homer is the ocean, the poet whose powerful, pervasive richness gives life to every literary genre, not only poetry, and every form of knowledge (Quint. 1.10.46), Hesiod’s discreet presence in Latin literature all the same exerted a widespread influence. Even a cursory examination shows that there are various literary genres for which it is possible to

²⁹ Cf. Fantuzzi (2000) 143–144, who also refers to the archaic precedents of the mythological-Hesiodic model of the *Theogony*.

identify a thematic or formal connection with the texts by Hesiod, or attributed to him.

As Quintilian attests (5.11.19), for example, the origin of the Aesopic fable could be traced back to him, evidently on the basis of the famous fable about the hawk and the nightingale (*Op.* 202–212):

Illae quoque fabellae quae, etiam si originem non ab Aesopo acceperunt (nam videtur earum primus auctor Hesiodus) ...

Consider also those fables which, though not originating with Aesop (for Hesiod seems to be the first author of them) ... (transl. Russell)

And just as he passes for the *primus inventor* of the genre of Aesop's fable, a literary form capable of enunciating a moral truth in simple terms, so in the same way Hesiod (together with Homer, and even more so than him) is the first great author of the classical tradition who provided material that was destined to converge into the tradition of advice poetry, and into the kind more properly defined as paroemiographic. On the other hand, thanks to the deep affinity that exists between the *ainos* and the proverb, both of which are the expressions of a popular kind of knowledge in a simple, immediately comprehensible form, it was inevitable that a text overflowing with sapiential culture like the *Works and Days* should promote collections of gnomologies and of proverbs, partly owing to the fact that their poetic form was already shaped for memorisation.³⁰

A familiarity with Hesiod, who had been called by Heraclitus "the teacher of most people" (57D–K), by Isocrates one "of the best advisors for the life of men" (*Ad Nicocl.* 43) and by Hermesianax "the keeper of all of history" (7.22 P.), must have been widespread, and favoured on various occasions of social and cultural life, from school onwards. As is understandable, both in view of the prestige deriving from his remote antiquity and the reputation of wisdom that accompanied his poetry, he was also given credit for his alleged pedagogic theories (Quintilian 1.1.15):

³⁰ Cf. Pellizer (1972); Ford (2002) 79; Petrakis (2003) *passim*; Hunter (2008). Above all the use of allegory goes back to Hesiod, that is to say, the personification of abstract entities or concepts (which through Statius and Prudentius gained widespread popularity in mediaeval time): it is significant that those which are familiar to us from Virgil (Fame) or from the epic Ovid (Envy, Hunger, Sleep, Fame) correspond to precise Hesiodic precedents (*Op.* 222–223 Hunger; 761–764 Fame; 759 Sleep; while the Sadness of *Scut.* 264 shows many of the characteristics of Ovid's Envy in *Met.* 2.760–782).

Quidam litteris instituendos qui minores septem annis essent non putaverunt, quod illa primum aetas et intellectum disciplinarum capere et laborem pati posset. In qua sententia Hesiodum esse plurimi tradunt qui ante grammaticum Aristophanem fuerunt (nam is primus ὑποθήκας, in quo libro scriptum hoc invenitur, negavit esse huius poetae).³¹

Some have held that children should not be taught to read under the age of seven, on the ground that this is the earliest age which can grasp the subjects taught and sustain the effort. This view is attributed to Hesiod by most writers who lived before Aristophanes the grammarian who was the first to deny that the *Hypothecae*, in which this can be found, was by that poet. (transl. Russell)

And Hesiod must have regularly been present in school. Even if Homer is the fundamental basis of the whole of the classical pedagogic tradition, the “educator of Greece” (according to Plato’s famous definition), Hesiod, too, must have occupied an important position among the *auctores* of the pedagogic tradition, not only in Greece,³² but also in Rome. Although he does not appear in the list of poets who seem to have been most popular at school (at least judging by the documentation of the papyri),³³ Hesiod must have been the subject of teaching courses in Rome by Greek grammarians working in the city, who dedicated specific commentaries and works to him: during the Augustan age, Aristonicus wrote a work about the “critical signs” of Aristarchus’ edition of the *Theogony*; likewise, Epaphroditus, who was active under the Flavians, wrote about the *Shield*; and in the same period, Plutarch himself, the author of various works about Hesiod, including a commentary in four books on the *Works and Days*, was frequently in Rome, and held lessons there.³⁴ Hesiod definitely appears, immediately after Homer (and before any lyric or Alexandrine poets), in the syllabus on which the teaching of Publius Papinius, the father of Statius, was based, during the early decades of the empire: cf. *Silv.* 5.3.150–151 *quantumque pios ditarit agrestes/Ascræus* (an expression which links the character of utility of the *Works and Days*

³¹ This collection of moral precepts, which has been shown to be an apocryphal composition by Aristophanes of Byzantium, is one of the many works (undoubtedly, or probably, spurious) which were attributed in antiquity to Hesiod (cf. Schwartz [1960]); this phenomenon, in itself, already proved the prestige of the author. A philological problem of doubtful paternity is mentioned by Cicero in connection with another maxim made to derive from Hesiod: *Ad Att.* 7.18.4 *ego autem etsi illud ψευδοκλόδειον (ita enim putatur) observo*, “μηδὲ δίκην ...” (cf. Most [2007] 350); Montanari, this volume.

³² Cf. Bonner (1977) 173; 218.

³³ Cf. Morgan (1998) 313.

³⁴ Cf. McNelis (2002) 78; see Cingano, this volume.

with the ethical panorama of the world of Hesiod, associating prosperity with virtue: cf. *Op.* 230 ff.).³⁵

At all events, a knowledge of Hesiod (or better, a specific knowledge of the *Works and Days*), probably not as a result of direct reading of his text, but in the mediated form of collections of ὑποθήκαι (like the one well-known to Quintilian, which was attributed to Hesiod) must have been widespread in learned circles. For example, it is obvious that we are not dealing with particular technical knowledge, a case of compulsory reading for the author of a treatise on agriculture (1.1.7), when Columella (*Rust.* 1.3.5) allows himself to quote in Greek, without any captions or explanatory comments, a verse from the *Works and Days* (348) which must have become proverbial:

dementis est ipsum sibi malam facere fortunam, quod facit, qui nequam vicinum suis nummis parat, cum a primis cunabulis, si modo liberis parentibus est oriundus, audisse potuerit: οὐδ' ἂν βοῦς ἀπόλοιτ' εἰ μὴ γείτων κακὸς εἴη.

It is the mark of a madman to create misfortunes for himself voluntarily; and this is what he does who spends his money in the purchase of a worthless neighbour, even though he might have heard, from his first days in the cradle, the Greek proverb: "Not even an ox would be lost but for an evil neighbour". (transl. Boyd Ash)

The fact that Hesiod could be quoted as an author commonly familiar to learned people is also suggested, for example, by the way in which Cicero mentions him, when, at the end of a letter to a friend, he recommends that his son should learn by heart and repeat one of Hesiod's maxims (*Fam.* 6.18.5):

Lepta suavissimus ediscat Hesiodum et habeat in ore "τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδοῶτα" et cetera.

Let Lepta, that most delightful of boys, get up his Hesiod by heart and have this on his lips "τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδοῶτα", and the rest of it. (transl. Glynn Williams)

The incomplete form of the quotation, which recalls the first hemistich of *Op.* 289, inviting the interlocutor to mentally supply the second one, implies that the latter possesses a knowledge of Hesiod, or at least of this maxim taken from his text.³⁶ And the fact that Hesiod's text was suited

³⁵ Cf. Gibson (2006) *ad loc.*

³⁶ On the fortunes of this Hesiodic maxim, cf. at least the apparatus of Rzach (1902) *ad loc.*

for providing maxims of everyday wisdom or commonplace morals³⁷ is confirmed in other passages, including those of Cicero, which repeatedly recall a well-known ethical principle laid down by Hesiod (*Off.* 1.48 *Quodsi ea, quae utenda acceperis, maiore mensura, si modo possis, iubet reddere Hesiodus, quidnam beneficio provocati facere debemus?*; *Brut.* 15 *illud Hesiodium laudatur a doctis, quod eadem mensura reddere iubet qua acceperis aut etiam cumulatione, si possis*),³⁸ or refer to facts of human experience filtered by the reflection of a moralising poet (*Pro Cluent.* 84 *Sapientissimum esse dicunt eum cui quod opus sit ipsi veniat in mentem; proxime accedere illum qui alterius bene inventis obtemperet. In stultitia contra est*).³⁹ And they even inspire his witty comments, like the one that is recounted in an anecdote told by Macrobius (*Sat.* 2.3.4), modelled on a paradoxical formulation of *Works and Days* 40, already exploited among the Greeks, and which would be also found in Ovid (*Fast.* 5.718 *dimidium toto munere maius erit*).

But of course Hesiod, as the master of wisdom, is above all the *auctor* of the didactic tradition. In the history of the genre, it is the *Works and Days* that introduces the characteristics which from then on define the specific nature of a didactic text in the Greek and Latin tradition: the declared intention to teach, the relationship between the poet and the reader seen as one of teacher and learner, the poetic self-awareness of the poet-teacher, and lastly the poetic “simultaneity”, that is to say, the arrangement of the text in accordance with a process of reasoning, its configuration as a didactic plot.⁴⁰ The presence of Hesiod in Latin didactic poetry can clearly be seen as early as Lucretius. Even if it was not intended to be confined within the limits of didactic poetry, but aims also to hold a dialogue with the great epic tradition, the *De rerum natura* recalls the *Works and Days* in various pointed echoes; above all, however, it is engaged in a constant implicit comparison with the great archaic model on the ideological level.⁴¹ Not only does the widespread agricultural

³⁷ See also the comments of Plutarch, *Theseus* 3.3.

³⁸ The reference is to *Op.* 349–350. But cf. also *Ad Att.* 13.12.3 *ego autem me parabam ad id quod ille mihi misisset ut “αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ καὶ λῶϊον”, si modo potuissem; nam hoc etiam Hesiodus ascribit, “αἶ καὶ δύνῃαι”*.

³⁹ The passage referred to is *Op.* 293 f., which was also familiar to Livy (22.29.8 “*saepe ego*” inquit, “*audivi, milites, eum primum esse virum qui ipse consulat quid in rem sit, secundum eum qui bene monenti oboediat; qui nec ipse consulere nec alteri parere sciat, eum extremi ingenii esse*”).

⁴⁰ These are the criteria that define the didactic genre (independently of the theoretical conscience of the ancients) according to Volk (2002) 36–41.

⁴¹ Gale (2000) 64–67.

imagery of the Latin poem recall the *Works and Days*, but Hesiod's poem becomes the precise polemical target of Lucretius' strenuous anti-mythological battle. It is him and his myth of the ages, together with the fantastic monstrous figures of the primordial world of the *Theogony*, such as the Chimaera or the Giants, that Lucretius refutes and rationalistically cuts down to size (5.904–915).⁴²

The demythologization of the world obviously entails important consequences on the ethical-ideological level: Hesiod's ideology, which associates and identifies agricultural productivity with divine intervention in human actions, is contradicted by the insistence on the fact that everything on earth takes place *opera sine divom* (1.158); and it is this widespread idea of the divine origin of agriculture, as a gift of Ceres, which it is his intention to refute by means of the thesis presented in the *Kulturgeschichte* in the fifth book, which attributes its invention, on the contrary, to *natura creatrix* (*At specimen sationis et insitionis origo / ipsa fuit rerum primum natura creatrix*, 1361–1362). But more generally, it is Hesiod's close link between the farmers' religious *pietas* and the success of their harvests, seen as a divine prize, or else their failure, seen as a punishment, that Lucretius rejects (2.167 ff.; 1164 ff.). What is criticised above all in Hesiod is the mythological origin of work, which is not the consequence of a punishment from Zeus, as a result of the theft of fire by Prometheus (*Op.* 42–105), or from Dike, as a result of the widespread injustice among mankind (213–262), or the degeneration of mankind in the passing of the ages (106–201). Just as the discovery of fire is due to an atmospheric phenomenon (5.1092 *fulmen detulit in terram mortalibus ignem*), so the evils that afflict humanity do not derive from Pandora, but are a part of nature (6.29–31; 5.195–234).⁴³ For the rationalist Lucretius, who excludes any divine intervention from his universe, both the Hesiod of the *Works and Days*, with his edifying ideology, and the other Hesiod, the poet of the *Theogony* and his fantastic mythological creatures, become targets for his criticism.

Whereas the presence of Hesiod in Lucretius is often implicit, as a target for his polemics, this not only becomes explicit in Virgil, but is even programmatically declared. It is by means of a reference to him as the direct model that the *Georgics* are affiliated to the genre for which

⁴² On the Lucretian "corrections" of the various aspects of the Golden Age, cf. Gale (1994) 161–174; on the Giants, 185–186.

⁴³ Gale (1994) 190.

Hesiod is the archegete, in the brief space of a literary self-reflection at the end of the *laudes Italiae* (2.173–176):

*salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
magna uirum: tibi res antiquae laudis et artem
ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis,
Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.*

Hail, great mother of fruits, land of Saturn,
great mother of men: it is for your sake that I embark
upon matters of ancient praise and art,
daring to open up holy fountains,
and I sing an Ascraean song through Roman towns.

The claim to be the Roman Hesiod (implicit in the idea of *primus* and the importation into Italy of a Greek genre)⁴⁴ had already been indirectly declared in the *incipit* of the first book: Servius already detected in the two initial statements of the programme—*Quid faciat laetas segetes* (the subject of vv. 43–203) and *quo sidere terram vertere* (vv. 204–350)—an indication of the Hesiodic model (respectively, the “works” and the “days”, that is to say, the farming activity, and the calendar throughout which it was to be distributed). This model is present particularly in the opening two sections of the first book of the poem, which are followed by the section on forecasts (351–514), which goes back to the “mediated” model, that is to say, to Aratus, who had been defined by Callimachus (*Epigr.* 27) as the Hellenistic Hesiod⁴⁵ and had aroused the admiration in Rome not only of Varro Atacinus, but also of Cicero, who both translated him. The Latin poet could thus refer, on the one hand, directly to the archaic model, to the poet with the reflective tones who was the champion of religious morality, and on the other, to his modern image, the Hesiod filtered by Alexandrine culture, that is to say, the taste for stylistic and formal refinement and allusive subtlety which had influenced the poets of the generation of Catullus in Rome, and of which the very label *Ascraeum carmen* is an expression.⁴⁶

Besides the echoes of expressions that are spread throughout the course of the poem,⁴⁷ the element of Hesiod’s poetry which is reflected in Virgil’s poem is above all the ethical-religious aspect, a vision of the world

⁴⁴ *Per oppida* seems effectively to insist, not so much on Rome and the city environment, but on the world of the Italic countryside, in line with the rural panorama of Hesiod’s work.

⁴⁵ On the Callimachean epigram, cf. Farrell (1991) 44–46.

⁴⁶ On this aspect, see Farrell (1991) ch. 2.

⁴⁷ Several detailed examples are to be found in La Penna (1962) and Farrell (1991).

based on justice and moderation, on the work ethic and its recompense by the gods. Hesiod is first of all the “poet of the earth” (*praeceptor arandi*, as Ovid calls him, *Fast.* 6.13),⁴⁸ that is to say, the poet of the simple life, and of those values that are typical of the rural world, which are perfectly in tune with the ethical-ideological programme of Augustan restoration. On the level of the theodicy, as we have seen, the need to work was for Hesiod a consequence of Zeus’ punishment of Prometheus and a sign of the degeneration of the ages, whereas in Virgil work springs from the will of Jupiter to rouse humanity from the inactivity of the Golden Age by introducing a stimulus to diligence and progress (1.117–159). Virgil’s position, which is influenced by Stoic theory (through Aratus), together with suggestions from Democritus and Epicurus (deriving mainly from the *Kulturgeschichte* of Book V of Lucretius), reveals clear traces of these heterogeneous components:⁴⁹ severe doubt remains regarding the providentialism of Jupiter, and an intrinsic conflict emerges between the sense of *labor improbus*, on the one hand, and an Arcadian idea of the country life on the other, a vision cultivated by bucolic poetry, and idealised by the Hellenistic philosophies. The philosophical stimulus to *autarkeia* is noticeable in the *Georgics*, and also creates points of friction with the archaically narrow perspective of Hesiod, the typical countryman from Boeotia, who aims solely at becoming rich (the opposition *laudato ingentia rura*, / *exiguum colito* di 2.412–413 seems to be a polemical answer to the advice of *Op.* 644).

The image of Justice, who, in leaving the earth, takes her last few steps among the farmers (2.473–474), is also mediated by Aratus (133 ff.), who combines Hesiod’s images of Nemesis and Aidos fleeing from the earth during the iron age (*Op.* 197–200) with that of the virgin goddess Dike (*Op.* 256–257). Indeed, this is an image which is later to become a symbol of the moral degeneration of humanity, and enjoys widespread popularity in the Latin poetic tradition (starting from the “translations” of Aratus and Catullus 64,⁵⁰ and going on to the Augustan poets and Juvenal, up to Avienus), partly as a result of its moralising attitude, together with the Hesiodic myth which acts as its framework, that is to say, the “metallic” myth of the ages and the progressive decadence that characterises them.⁵¹

⁴⁸ A definition which sounds intentionally antonymic with respect to the *praeceptor amandi* that Ovid had chosen for himself in *Ars* 2.161.

⁴⁹ Still crucial on this subject La Penna (1962).

⁵⁰ Pontani (2000) 274–275.

⁵¹ On the extensive use of the topos in Latin literature, mingled with the myth of the ages, cf. at least Landolfi (1996) and Bellandi-Berti-Ciappi (2001).

Clear echoes of Hesiod's didactic model may also be discovered in the opening sections of Ovid's *Fasti*, which recall the meeting of Callimachus (in turn taken from Hesiod) with the Muses, and the chaos which in the archaic text (and which is also alluded to in the Hellenistic text) marked the beginning of everything: the initial god of the poem, Janus,⁵² is identified with this Chaos, and its first word (*disce*, 101) indicates the genre that the text belongs to. Not only that, but the whole work of the great Greek model seems to be condensed in Janus' words: his endless old age allows him to have a knowledge of all the ages of man, and the moralistic-sententious tone, deploring the desire for riches and the wickedness of the times, make him a veritable "super-Hesiod" (Barchiesi) who raises themes that are crucial for the Augustan ideology and its nostalgic primitivism.⁵³

4. *The poet of the gods and their loves*

Besides being the *auctor* of didactic poetry, Hesiod is, partly as a result of the prestige that derives from his antiquity, a master of truth, or indeed, the prototype of the poet-*vates* as imagined by Augustan culture: a figure possessing a high moral authority, in contact with the divine world, engaged in an important civic function. Unlike Homer, Hesiod was the first poet who could offer a cosmic perspective and dimension, a corpus of texts in which theological and religious erudition were integrated with ethical and social knowledge within the framework of a wide-ranging chronological panorama, thus providing the ancient reader with an overall vision of the world and life, but also a "philosophy of history". It is in this perspective that he is seen, for example, albeit with an emphasis on the new "scientific" direction, in a framework of Stoic cosmology, by the didactic poet Manilius, who offers us a unitary synthesis of his work (2.11–24):

*sed proximus illi
Hesiodus memorat divos divumque parentes
et chaos enixum terras orbemque sub illo
infantem et primos titubantia sidera cursus
Titanasque senes, Iovis et cunabula magni*

⁵² Cf. Barchiesi (1994) 220 ff.

⁵³ On the function of Hesiod as a reagent for the definition of Ovid's Augustanism, cf. also Labate (2005).

*et sub fratre viri nomen, sine matre parentis,
 atque iterum patrio nascentem corpore Bacchum,
 silvarumque deos secretaque numina Nymphas.
 Quin etiam ruris cultus legesque notavit
 militiamque soli, quod colles Bacchus amaret,
 quod fecunda Ceres campos, quod Pallas utrumque,
 atque arbusta vagis essent quod adultera pomis;
 omniaque immenso volitantia lumina mundo,
 pacis opus, magnos naturae condit in usus.*

But Hesiod is next to him and tells of the gods and parents of the gods, Chaos in travail with Earth, and after Chaos the childhood of the world, the stars faltering as they first embarked on their courses, the ancient Titans, the cradling of mighty Jove, Jove who gained husband's name as brother and father's for one no mother bare, Bacchus born a second time from his father's body, the woodland deities and those retiring spirits, the Nymphs. He further told of tillage of the countryside and its laws and man's warfare with the soil, of the love of Bacchus for the hills, of fertile Ceres for the plains, and of Pallas for both, and of the grafting of errant fruits on trees as though in illicit union; moreover, a task of peace, he establishes the courses of all the luminaries through the vast heavens so as to further the great designs of nature. (transl. Goold)

Hesiod's entire production is illustrated here in succession, from the *Theogony* to the *Catalogue*⁵⁴ and the *Works and Days*, finishing off with the work on astronomy⁵⁵ which was attributed to him (Pliny, among others, makes reference to it, *Nat.* 18.213)⁵⁶ and might also make the ancient Greek poet appear, in the eyes of Manilius, to be a specific precursor of his own poem. Manilius seems almost to identify the intention of the theologian and philosopher Hesiod to construct a framework of universal history (both *Theogony* plus *Catalogue* and the *Works and Days*, that is to say, from the chaos of the origins to the days of the poet), including all the events, both of the world of the gods and that of mortal men. In so doing, Manilius actually anticipates the recent tendency of Hesiodic

⁵⁴ I believe that the allusions in vv. 16–18 to episodes of divine genealogies absent from the *Theogony* may be interpreted as references to the *Catalogue* (which continued and integrated the *Theogony*); on the contrary, they have been seen as the proof of an indirect knowledge of Hesiod's poem (Landolfi [2003] 49–51). The “double birth” of Bacchus was not a subject of the *Theogony* (where it is only said that Semele bore Dionysus to Zeus: vv. 940–942), but it is likely that it found space as an antecedent of fr. 103 (cf. Hirschberger [2004] 77; 257).

⁵⁵ To which the penultimate verse (independently of its positioning, which is much discussed) clearly alludes.

⁵⁶ Cf. Schwartz (1960) 248–261; Cingano, this volume.

criticism⁵⁷ to see the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* as two complementary works which are integrated in the framework of an ambitious project, of which they represent the chronological extremes and two different points of view. That is to say, the two works outline a process in which, respectively, they tell of the origins of the cosmos and the establishment of the power of Zeus in the divine world, and then, from a human viewpoint, they illustrate the norms governing the relationships between mortals and the ethical laws in relationships with the gods.

This framework, which is at the same time mythical and historical, acts as a background, as we shall see, to a work like the *Metamorphoses* by Ovid, but Hesiod's mantic voice was present also in the background of such an explicitly Homeric poem as the *Aeneid*: the primordial clashes of the *Theogony* between Olympic divinities and the forces of chaos and disorder offer themselves as an allegorical reading of the clash between Augustus and his enemies, and legitimize his power;⁵⁸ in the same way, the genealogical sequence, with its combinations of immortals and mortals, at the basis of the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue*, may suggest an analogy (and a legitimate aetiology) with the history of the *gens Iulia* which runs from Venus to Augustus himself.⁵⁹

The attraction that the Hesiodic model of universal history must have exerted for Latin literature finds its first visible trace, as is known, in Silenus' song in Virgil's sixth eclogue. This song starts with a cosmogony (31–40) followed, after a brief mention of the flood and the Golden Age (41), by the theft of Prometheus (42), and finally by a list of mythical tragic loves (Hylas, Pasiphae, the daughters of Proetus, Atalanta, the sisters of Phaethon, Scylla, Tereus and Philomela). However, during the course of this catalogue, he inserts a scene in which the poet Cornelius Gallus is conducted by a Muse to Mount Helicon, where the mythical singer Linus presents him, on behalf of the Muses, with the pipes that they had once given to Hesiod (69–71 *hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae, / Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat / cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos*), inviting him to use them to sing of the origins of the wood of Grinium (that is to say, themes in the style of Euphoriion). This ceremony of poetic investiture which makes Gallus an *alter Hesiodus* (and is to be seen in connection with the programmatic

⁵⁷ Cf. above all Clay (2003).

⁵⁸ Hardie (1986) is fundamental.

⁵⁹ Hardie (2005) 288. On the presence in the *Aeneid* of the *Shield*, cf. Faber (2000).

rejection of the Homeric poem in vv. 3–5) suggests a key role for Gallus as a mediator in the Latin reception of Hesiod;⁶⁰ and much has been speculated about the ways in which Gallus (who very probably also represented his own poetic investiture on Mount Helicon) may have fulfilled this function.⁶¹

At all events, rather than as a source for single themes, Hesiod's model must have been taken both as a structural framework and as a literary project. The pattern returns in Virgil as a plan for the song of the nymph Clymene in the *Georgics* (4.345–347):

*inter quas curam Clymene narrabat inanem
Volcani, Martisque dolos et dulcia furta,
aque Chao densos divum numerabat amores.*⁶²

among these Clymene was telling of Vulcan's baffled care, of the wiles and stolen joys of Mars, and from Chaos on was rehearsing the countless loves of the gods. (transl. Fairclough)

Here we have a subject, whose origins are Homeric, inserted into a theogonic framework of a Hesiodic kind, and then both introduced into the sphere of love poetry (the same verse appears also to integrate the *Catalogue* into the *Theogony*), in line with the modern Alexandrine and neoteric taste. The outline presented by the Virgilian narrator is a literary project that was to find its full realisation in another great Augustan text, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In this (Gallian?) model we find the closest precedent for a poem whose wide-ranging framework of universal history includes a long series of mythical loves. The *Theogony* provided the starting-point for the chronological structure that went from chaos to the days of the author, but at the same time Ovid (1.89–150) could draw from the *Works and Days* the myth of the ages which serves as an ideological premise to introduce a series of myths based on the conflict between men and gods (from Lycaon onwards), and more generally, to start off the evolution of human history.⁶³ Lastly, the *Catalogue*, which opened with the heroic age (destined to end with the war of Troy), characterised by a common life between gods and mortals, with the genealogical sequence of the "divine loves", could offer a useful

⁶⁰ Now cf. also Cairns (2006) 120–131; on Propertius 2.10.25–26, which refers to Virgil's passage, cf. Fedeli (2005) *ad loc.* (with further references).

⁶¹ The basic data are to be found in Clausen (1994) 177–178 and 199–204. A paper by J. Farrell is shortly forthcoming on this subject.

⁶² Cf. Farrell (1991) 270–271.

⁶³ On Hesiod as a model for Ovid (also through Hellenistic mediation) cf., after La Penna (1962) 222, e.g. Myers (1994) 3–21.

trace for the large section (the time of myth and the time of the heroes) which occupies more than two thirds of the *Metamorphoses* (the Trojan war is introduced in Book XII).⁶⁴ In the same way, the centrality of the female principle in the genealogical structure offered an alternative to Homeric epic (centered on male heroism),⁶⁵ as the model of a new, different Ovidian epic, open to love and to the female.

The influence of the *Catalogue* (albeit with the probable mediation of the *Bibliotheca* of pseudo-Apollodorus) has been underlined in various parts of the poem,⁶⁶ above all in the icon of “divine loves” which is Arachne’s tapestry (*Met.* 6.103–128).⁶⁷ However, it seems that both the tone and the aim of this work differ markedly from those of the model: while the intention of the (pseudo-)Hesiodic text was, as far as we can see (Dio Chrys. *Orat.* 2.14, *cit. supra*), celebratory, in the sense that the inclusion of various women in the list of divine love-affairs was intended to be a way of honouring those who had been an object of passion among the gods, Arachne, the humble woman from Colophon (6.7–13), the rationalistic fellow-citizen of Xenophanes, composes a work with a completely different aim, polemical and aggressive, against the gods of Olympus. Its divine loves are related, not from the point of view of members of the heroic world, nor of those who share an attitude of religious *pietas* and regard the union with the gods as a sign of a privilege accorded to those humans who are felt to be very close to heavenly status, but rather from the point of view of those who see in these episodes a trial of strength on the part of a superior power, who seeks nothing more than the satisfaction *in corpore vili* of his own needs. For her, the *placuisse deo* is not a title that a woman can exhibit as the beneficiary of a privilege (like the Sibylla in *Met.* 14.150), but a hateful presupposition which makes her the simple instrument of pleasure for an abusing power; in other words, Arachne re-writes a profane, desecrating version of the *Catalogue*.

Arachne’s anti-Hesiodic polemic is part of a tradition of theological debate which started with Xenophanes (who links Hesiod and Homer

⁶⁴ The structural link that connected the *Catalogue* to the *Theogony* seems to have left a trace in the technique of transition which Ovid used to connect the second and third books of the *Ars*: cf. Gibson (2003) 86.

⁶⁵ As was already observed by Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 2.14 (cf. *supra*).

⁶⁶ Cf. now Fletcher (2005) (with previous bibliography) and Farrell forthcoming.

⁶⁷ Cf. Obbink (2004) 194 ff. and Fletcher (2005) 303–309. Propertius too appears to refer to this tradition: 2.30.27–30 *illic aspicias scopulis haerere Sorores / et canere antiqui dulcia furta Iovis, / ut Semelast combustus, ut est deperditus Io, / denique ut ad Troiae tecta volarit avis*.

together, because they are guilty of representing the gods as “committing theft and adultery and deceiving each other”: 21 B 11 DK);⁶⁸ after Plato, this debate comes to a crucial point in the Epicurean school, before finding its natural outcome in the rough, anti-pagan polemics of the Church Fathers.⁶⁹ The work by the Epicurean Philodemus, *De pietate*, includes a list of the loves of Neptune, which not only corresponds to some of those represented by Arachne (*Met.* 6.115–120), but also finds a clear parallel in the catalogue of the women loved by the god, as listed in Ovid’s version of Hero’s epistle (*Her.* 19.129–138), where she expressly refers to the poetic tradition of love catalogues (... *et quarum memini nomina lecta mihi. / Has certe pluresque canunt ... poetae*). Little remains to us of this tradition, and much must have been lost, for which Hesiod was undoubtedly the archetype and the most illustrious model.⁷⁰

5. *The poet of peace and regret*

The qualification of Hesiod as the “poet of peace”, which, as we have seen, was attributed to him by Velleius (*otii quietisque cupidissimus*, 1.7.1), must have been a recognised characteristic of the poet, if we consider that this was the decisive argument which made the *Certamen*, contrary to every expectation based on the development of the contest, finish with the victory of Hesiod over Homer:⁷¹

But the king gave the crown to Hesiod, declaring that it was right that he who called upon men to follow peace and husbandry should have the prize rather than one who dwelt on war and slaughter (13).

[transl. Evelyn-White]

⁶⁸ On this Xenophanian line in Ovid’s poem cf. also Trencsényi-Waldapfel (1969).

⁶⁹ Cf. Wolbergs (1988) 1200–1203.

⁷⁰ Obbink (2004) 199 thinks that the relationship (of Philodemus, as well as of Ovid, and of the epitomator of the *Bibliotheca* of pseudo-Apollodorus) with Hesiod’s *Catalogue* is mediated by the work *On the gods* by Apollodorus of Athens, but there is no reason to exclude a direct knowledge (Hardie [2005] 297–298).

⁷¹ It is clear that the opposition between a Homer, the poet of war, and a Hesiod, the poet of peace, is based on the comparison between the *Iliad* (and not the *Odyssey*), on the one hand, and the *Works and Days* on the other, the same opposition which seems to be presupposed in the juxtaposition of the two poets in Ovid, *Am.* 1.15.9–12. Cf. also, in Manilius, 2.1 *certamina* (*Iliad*) vs 24 *pacis opus* (*Works and Days*).

As the representative of a peaceful ethos, foreign to the world of war and its values, almost Epicurean in its love for *otium*, Hesiod could offer an alternative model to the heroic-Homeric one, promoting a pacifist ideology like that of the love elegy. Besides being rooted in the tradition of Hellenistic culture, which recognised a central role for Hesiod, for reasons both of form and of content, the appreciation of Latin elegiac poets must have been the natural consequence of the crucial role that he played (even if this is largely unclear to us) in the work of the archetypal of the genre, Cornelius Gallus. While Propertius could take him as a model for his *Dichterweihe*, and thus for his profile as a poet (also as the Roman equivalent of Callimachus, the “Hellenistic Hesiod”), Tibullus, a *laudator temporis acti* and a lover of the simple country life, found in Hesiod the definition of an ideal universe for his *aristos bios*.⁷² Thus, the exaltation of the humble life comforted by the love of members of the family (1.10.39–40 *Quam potius laudandus hic est, quem prole parata / occupat in parva pigra senecta casa*) seems to describe a Hesiodic kind of picture, and the commemoration of the Golden Age in 1.3.35–50, even more so, seems to combine a series of typically Hesiodic themes and topics:

*Quam bene Saturno vivebant rege, priusquam
tellus in longas est patefacta vias!
Nondum caeruleas pinus contempserat undas,
effusum ventis praebueratque sinum;
nec vagus ignotis repetens conpendia terris
presserat externa navita merce ratem.
Illo non validus subiit iuga tempore taurus,
non domito frenos ore momordit equus,
non domus ulla fores habuit, non fixus in agris,
qui regeret certis finibus arva, lapis.
Ipsae mella dabant quercus, ultroque ferebant
obvia securis ubera lactis oves.
Non acies, non ira fuit, non bella, nec ense
inmiti saevus duxerat arte faber.
Nunc Iove sub domino caedes et vulnera semper,
nunc mare, nunc leti mille repente viae.*

How good the life in Saturn's reign, before
the world was opened into long roads!
Pine timbers then had not defied blue waves
or spread billowing canvas to the winds.
No roving sailor seeking profit from strange lands
had freighted ship with foreign merchandise.

⁷² On Hesiod in Tibullus, cf. above all Grimal (1962).

No mighty bull in those days bore the yoke
 or stallion tamely chawed the bit.
 Houses had no doors. No stone stood in the fields
 to rule the arable with straight edge.
 There was honey from the oak, and heavy-uddered ewes
 offered milk on meeting carefree countryfolk.
 Anger and armies and war were not yet known:
 no blacksmith's cruel craft had forged the sword.
 But now, in Jove's dominion, it is always wounds and slaughter;
 now there is the sea and sudden Death's one thousand roads.

(transl. Lee)

This appreciation of the Hesiodic myth of an *aurea aetas*, unaware of the hardness of work, or of any form of violence or greed, returns several times in Tibullus, and gives expression to that nostalgic attitude of idealisation of the past which is a constant of Latin culture. Likewise, the moralistic condemnation of the present which we find in another famous elegy by Tibullus has an equally Hesiodic ring to it:

*Divitis hoc vitium est auri, nec bella fuerunt,
 faginus adstabat cum scyphus ante dapes.
 Non arces, non vallus erat, somnumque petebat
 securus sparsas dux gregis inter oves.
 Tunc mihi vita foret, Valgi, nec tristia nossem
 arma nec audissem corde micante tubam* (1.10.7–12)

Rich gold—the fault lies there. No wars when stoups of beechwood
 stood at the sacrificial feast,
 no citadels, no palisades. The leader led a flock
 and sued for sleep in safety among the speckled ewes.
 O Valgius, were I living then, never had I known
 sad arms or heard the trumpet with a pounding heart.

(transl. Lee)

The regret of Tibullus, who complains that he did not live in that blessed age, without any wars or lust for wealth, seems to be a direct echo of the analogous regret of Hesiod that he did not live in an age different from his own, a more ancient, and thus morally more unspoiled, age (*Op.* 174 ff. “If only then I did not have to live among the fifth men, but could have either died first or been born afterwards! For now the race is indeed one of iron. And they will not cease from toil and distress by day ...”).

This nostalgic regret finds an answer in Ovid's well-known passage in *Ars* 3.121–122 *Prisca iuvent alios: ego me nunc denique natum/gratulor: haec aetas moribus apta meis*. The poet, who is enthusiastic about modernity, celebrates the new, true golden age (*simplicitas rudis ante fuit: nunc*

aurea Roma est, / et domiti magnas possidet orbis opes, 113–114), mocking the nostalgia for the past, or rather, its rhetoric and its most abused myths.⁷³ The anti-Hesiodic criticism has as its targets those who idealise the past, like Tibullus, Propertius and, no less, Virgil, that is to say, the political use that the Augustan ideology had made of the myth of the ages, of which the fourth eclogue is the most famous example. The themes and the images that we saw above in Tibullus (the oak-trees oozing honey, nature spontaneously offering nourishment for men, who live in peace in their own land, without venturing out on to the seas in search of gain) have a remote Hesiodic origin (*Op.* 232–237), but they had been at the centre of Virgil's representation of the *aurea aetas*, of which the eclogue predicts the return in the near future.⁷⁴ An epoch of peace, justice and well-being which lies in Rome's future, inverting the progressively degenerative trend of the Hesiodic pattern, and projecting the climax and the completion of history to the arrival of the *aurea saecula*.⁷⁵

Another theme which dates back to Hesiod and his representation of the Golden Age, which became a popular topic for Roman moralistic thought, is the condemnation of navigation (*Op.* 236 f., 618). This develops as an invention made inevitable by need, but it is built up by the greed for trading profit, and thus becomes a symbol of wicked daring, which induces man to violate the bounds fixed by nature. An alteration of customs, therefore, which in turn gives rise to all kinds of excess and violation of limits and ethical norms: wandering over the seas becomes the symbol of a life consumed in satisfying the desire for wealth, as opposed to an existence linked to the earth and its natural values.⁷⁶ In this perspective, the topos is variously declined: besides Ovid, *Met.* 1.94–96 *non-dum caesa suis, peregrinum ut viseret orbem, / montibus in liquidas pinus descenderat undas, / nullaque mortales praeter sua litora norant*, cf. e.g. Sen. *Med.* 301–304 *Audax nimium qui freta primus / rate tam fragili perfida rupit / terrasque suas post terga videns / animam levibus credidit auris*; 329–334 *Candida nostri saecula patres / videre procul fraude remota. / sua quisque piger litora tangens / patrioque senex factus in arvo, / parvo dives nisi quas tulerat / natale solum non norat opes*. In Hesiod's myth of the

⁷³ See, on this subject, the observations of Gibson (2003) 134–140, and Barchiesi (1994) 224–225.

⁷⁴ On this topic, cf. above all Kubusch (1986).

⁷⁵ Among the best-known cases of the topos is Ovid, *Met.* 1.89 ff. (cf. now Barchiesi [2005], with bibliography).

⁷⁶ On the ψόγος ναυτιλίας cf. at least Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) 43–44, 53–54, and Heydenreich (1970).

ages and general moralistic attitude, Roman love for the past found a reference point. It was, therefore, this literary authority who combined an ethical attitude with a panorama and an appropriate “philosophy of history”.

6. Poetry for kings: Hesiod and encomiastic poetry

Although the polarisation with Homer associates the latter with the world of heroes and an aristocratic ethic, and Hesiod with the humble world of farmers, it should not be forgotten that in the *Certamen* between the two poets it is a king that assigns the victory to Hesiod. As if it were Hesiod’s poetry, rather than that of Homer, which offered a framework within which could be set the relationship between a poet and power, and which indicated a suitable space and role for an artist. From a Hesiodic perspective, the poets, men loved by the Muses, sing of kings, who in turn are loved and protected by Zeus (*Th.* 80–93), the father of the Muses and the guarantor of cosmic order: in a word, a cohesion and ideological solidarity is created between the heavenly (i.e. religious) authority, the earthly (political) authority and the literary authority. The good sovereign is one who, enjoying the protection of Zeus, guarantees peace and agricultural prosperity for his people (*Op.* 225–237, 280–281, 312–313 etc.): this theme is taken up by Hellenistic poetry in the Theocritean *Encomium* by Ptolemy Philadelphus (*Id.* 17.77–120) and in the *Hymn to Zeus* by Callimachus (79–90), who combined the idea of the “righteous and prosperous city” of the *Works and Days* with that of the king loved by the Muses of the *Theogony*.⁷⁷

This Hesiodic link, taken up by Hellenistic poetry, between the heavenly sovereign and the earthly one, confirmed by the Muse, is the premise on which the ideological basis for the whole of encomiastic poetry is founded. It is the power of the king that allows the Muse to transmit her gifts, which are for the benefit of the community: in other words, it is only through political authority that poetry can exercise its educational functions. And it is thus the task of the good king to offer protection and support to the poet, in order that their alliance and combined action may give rise to ethical and political benefits in the interest of the entire community.

⁷⁷ Cf. Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 353.

This set of themes clearly emerges from the fully Hesiodic story in Ovid's *Fasti* (5.11–46), in which the Muse Polyhymnia explains the origins of the goddess *Maiestas*:⁷⁸

*post chaos ut primum data sunt tria corpora mundo
 inque novas species omne recessit opus,
 pondere terra suo subsedit et aequora traxit:
 at caelum levitas in loca summa tulit;
 sol quoque cum stellis nulla gravitate retentus
 et vos, Lunares, exsiluistis, equi.
 sed neque terra diu caelo, nec cetera Phoebos
 sidera cedebant: par erat omnis honos.
 saepe aliquis solio, quod tu, Saturne, tenebas,
 ausus de media plebe sedere deus:
 nec latus Oceano quisquam deus advena iunxit,
 et Themis extremo saepe recepta loco est,
 donec Honor placidoque decens Reverentia voltu
 corpora legitimis imposuere toris.
 hinc sata Maiestas, hos est dea censa parentes,
 quaque die partu est edita, magna fuit.
 nec mora, consedit medio sublimis Olympo
 aurea, purpureo conspicienda sinu;
 consedere simul Pudor et Metus. omne videres
 numen ad hanc voltus composuisse suos.
 protinus intravit mentes suspectus honorum:
 fit pretium dignis, nec sibi quisque placet.
 hic status in caelo multos permansit in annos,
 dum senior fati excidit arce deus.
 Terra feros partus, immania monstra, Gigantas
 edidit ausuros in Iovis ire domum.
 mille manus illis dedit et pro cruribus angues,
 atque ait "in magnos arma movete deos."
 exstruere hi montes ad sidera summa parabant
 et magnum bello sollicitare Iovem;
 fulmina de caeli iaculatus Iuppiter arce
 vertit in auctores pondera vasta suos.
 his bene Maiestas armis defensa deorum
 restat, et ex illo tempore culta manet.
 assidet inde Iovi, Iovis est fidissima custos,
 et praestat sine vi sceptrum timenda Iovi.*

"After chaos, as soon as the three elements were given to the world, and the whole creation resolved itself into new species, the earth subsided by its own weight, and drew the seas after it, but the sky was borne to the

⁷⁸ Among the most recent analyses, cf. Barchiesi (1991) 8–10; Labate (2005) 194–198.

highest regions by its own lightness; the sun, too, not checked by gravity, and the stars, and you, ye horses of the moon, ye bounded high. But for a long time neither did Earth yield pride of place to Sky, nor did the other heavenly bodies to Phoebus; their honours were all equal. Often someone of the common sort of gods would dare to sit upon the throne which thou, Saturn, didst own; not one of the upstart deities took the outer side of Ocean, and Themis was often relegated to the lowest place, until Honour and comely Reverence with her calm look united in lawful wedlock. From that union sprang Majesty, who was great on the very day she was born. Without delay she took her seat high in the midst of Olympus, a golden figure far seen in purple vest. With her sat Modesty and Fear. You might see every divinity modelling his aspect upon hers. Straightway respect for dignities made its way into their minds; the worthy got their due, and nobody thought much of himself. This state of things in heaven lasted for many a year, till fate banished the elder god from heaven's citadel. Earth brought forth the Giants, a fierce mansion; she gave them a thousand hands, and great gods." They set themselves to pile up the mountains to the topmost stars and to harass great Jupiter in war. From heaven's citadel Jupiter hurled thunderbolts and turned the ponderous weights upon their movers. These weapons of the gods protected Majesty well; she survived and has been worshipped ever since. Hence she sits beside Jupiter, she is Jupiter's most faithful guardian; she assures to him his sceptre's peaceful tenure. (transl. Frazer)

In the process which sees the creation of the cosmos from Chaos, *Maestas* finds her place in the Olympic assembly, together with a series of Hesiodic, and at the same time, very Roman divinity-values. The Giants' attempt to subvert this order is repulsed by Jupiter, who restores the established order, thus winning the gratitude and the respect of the other gods, who recognise his supreme power: *Maestas*, who was born from *Honor* and *Reverentia*, is a sort of symbol of this power system, flanked by *Pudor* and *Metus*. The markedly Hesiodic framework—a Muse who intones a hymn to the goddess, who in turn acts as a custodian of the Olympic order, thus recalling the mythical clash which gave rise to and legitimated the established power,—also expresses a particular conception of the relationship between the Muse and the gods. In the *Theogony*, the Muses gladden the mind of Jupiter, singing hymns in his honour (vv. 36–37); and as the Muses are the model that the poet must imitate, he will be bound to celebrate his gods, that is to say, the earthly power that guarantees the established order.

This is the function which, not surprisingly, is theorised for the poet in Horace's Roman odes. The Hesiodic model, which in a certain sense was the archetype of this concept of an ethical-political function of poetry,

has long been identified in the fourth ode:⁷⁹ the image of the Muses who refresh Augustus after the battle (3.4.37–40) and inspire his *lene consilium*, followed by the detailed description of the Gigantomachy (42–58), is clearly modelled on the proem of the *Theogony*, where the Muses are first presented praising Zeus and singing of his strength and his victory over the Giants (49–52),⁸⁰ and then Calliope instructs the king to administer his kingdom wisely and to perform works of peace (80–93).⁸¹ But another reference to the Hesiodic text can be found in the “model of power” of *vis temperata* (66), strength which is not dissociated from wisdom, because in the *Theogony*, Jupiter’s supremacy as the king of the immortal gods (who themselves offer him the role of leader: 883) is first legitimized by his victory over the Titans, and then finds its necessary complement in his recourse to *metis* (886 ff.) and *themis* (901 ff.), seeing that wisdom and justice are the foundation of the ideal form of power (like that of Augustus).

Ovid’s story about *Maiestas* lends itself to a somewhat unfavourable interpretation of this idealistic concept of poetry allied to power, and the tolerance of the latter;⁸² but his attitude is understandably different in one of his last compositions from his exile at Tomi. It is again to Hesiod’s *Theogony* that he alludes when, in order to give an example of the immortalising power of poetry and the mythopoeic capacity of literature, he lists a series of myths of the epic-tragic tradition (*Pont.* 4.8.55–60):

*Di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt
tantaque maiestas ore canentis eget.
Sic Chaos ex illa naturae mole prioris
digestum partes scimus habere suas;
sic adfectantes caelestia regna Gigantes
ad Styga nimbifero vindicis igne datos.*

⁷⁹ La Penna (1963) 110; now cf. Nisbet-Rudd (2004) 54–56.

⁸⁰ On the topic of Jupiter’s pleasure in listening to the epos of his victory, cf. also Ovid, *Trist.* 2.69–72; Valerius Fl. 5.692–693; Statius, *Theb.* 6.355–359; *Silv.* 4.2.55–56.

⁸¹ Another of Horace’s odes which makes a claim for the ethical and political role of the poet reveals the presence of Hesiod: the image of the Muse who, at the poet’s birth, looks benignly at him (4.3.1–2) again goes back to the proem of the *Theogony* (81–83), mediated, however, by the version of Callimachus (*Ait. fr.* 1.37–38), who had transferred the sign of the divine privilege from the figure of the king to that of the poet. On Hesiod in Horace, some comments may be found in Pascucci (1997).

⁸² See the brilliant observations of Barchiesi (1991) 10, who also points out the important role that Pindar’s *Hymn to Zeus* must have played in this conception.

Even the gods, if 'tis right to say this, are created by verse; their mighty majesty needs the bard's voice. By this it is that we know that Chaos became separated from that mass of earlier nature and took on his divisions; by this that the Giants aiming at the sovereignty of heaven were hurled to the Styx by the cloud-bearing thunderbolt of the avenger. (transl. Wheeler)

The idea that the poets "created" the gods sounds like a repetition of Herodotus' statement (2.53) that it was Homer and Hesiod who founded the Greeks' theology, defining the names, the attributes, the capacities and the forms of the gods; and the reference to the cosmogony and the Gigantomachy confirms that Ovid is alluding to Hesiod's *Theogony* (any mention of Chaos is, in itself, a virtual reference to Hesiod).⁸³ The Hesiodic model, proposed here as an instrument capable of eternalising the subject of its song, is further defined by means of a god and a demi-god, respectively Bacchus and Herakles, and lastly, the deified Augustus himself:

*sic victor laudem superatis Liber ab Indis,
Alcides capta traxit ab Oechalia,
et modo, Caesar, avum, quem virtus addidit astris,
sacrarunt aliqua carmina parte tuum.* (61–64)

by this that victorious Liber won renown from the conquering of the Indies, Alcides from the capture of Oechalia. And but now, O Caesar, the grandsire, whom his virtue has sent to the starry heaven, owed in some measure his sanctity to verse. (transl. Wheeler)

Now, the text which starts from Chaos, and sings of gods and demi-gods, and finishes with the apotheosis of Augustus, is none other than the *Metamorphoses*: Ovid here engages in a discussion with Germanicus and claims *a posteriori* for his major work a role of glorification for the benefit of the Julian family. In this sense, indeed, a comparison seems to be created with the other great Augustan text-monument, that is to say, the *Aeneid*; as if the choice of the Hesiodic model was intended to indicate its greater efficacy compared with the Homeric model, of the *Metamorphoses* compared with the *Aeneid* (a dissociation already anticipated in vv. 31–32 *Nec tibi de Pario statuam, Germanice, templum / marmore*), as

⁸³ See also Propertius 2.10, for whom the Gigantomachy, that is to say, a kind of Hesiodic epic, is the mythical-literary model through which the victorious achievements of Augustus against the threats of subversion coming from the East (Parthians, Arabs) are to be celebrated: this is the sense of the reference to the *Ascraeos fontes* (v. 25), according to Cairns (2006) 332–334.

an instrument for the celebration of power.⁸⁴ And in the changed conditions, the poet presents the new god (v. 23) with an implicit attempt at negotiation: he offers himself as the *vates* of the young prince in exchange for a more lenient sentence (vv. 85–88). When power has revealed its autocratic nature to Ovid, nothing is left but to appeal to the idyllic model of a harmonious, cooperative relationship between the poet and the good king which Hesiod had outlined. But this myth too was to prove for him to be a vain fantasy of a Golden Age which had passed for ever.

⁸⁴ Cf. the obvious reference to *Georg.* 3.13 *templum de marmore ponam*, which was known as an allusion to an epic poem in honour of Augustus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley CA.
- Ahrens, H.L. 1843. *De dialecto Dorica*. Göttingen.
- , 1853. *Über die Mischung der Dialekte in der griechischen Lyrik*, in: *Verhandlungen der 13. Versammlung deutscher Philologen, Schulmänner und Orientalisten*, Göttingen, 55–78 (repr. in Ahrens 1891, 157–181).
- , 1891. *Kleine Schriften*. Hannover.
- Algra, K. 2001. “Comments or commentary? Zeno of Citium and Hesiod’s *Theogonia*”, *Mnemosyne* 54, 562–581.
- Allen, N. 2004. “Bhīṣma and Hesiod’s Succession Myth”, *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 8/1–3, 57–79.
- Allen, T.W. (ed.) 1912. *Homeri Opera V* (Hymns, Cycle, fragments). Oxford.
- Aloni, A. 1989. *Laedo e i tiranni: Ricerche sull’Inno omerico ad Apollo*. Rome.
- , 1992. “Proemio e funzione proemiale nella poesia greca arcaica”, in: AA.VV. (eds.), *Lirica greca e latina: Atti del convegno di studi polacco-italiano* (Poznan, 2–5 May 1990), Rome, 99–130.
- , 1998. *Cantare glorie di eroi*. Turin.
- Alster, B. 1974. *The Instructions of Suruppak. A Sumerian Proverb Collection*. Copenhagen.
- Aly, W. 1913. *Hesiods Theogonie mit Einleitung und kurzem Kommentar versehen*. Heidelberg.
- , 1921. *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*. Göttingen.
- , 1954. *Praxiphanes*, *RE* XXII, cols. 1769–1784.
- , 1966. “Hesiodos von Askra und der Verfasser der *Theogonie*”, in: E. Heitsch (ed.), *Hesiod*, Darmstadt, 50–99.
- Andrews, M.E. 1943. “Hesiod and Amos”, *Journal of Religion* 23, 194–205.
- Archi, A. 1995. “Hittite and Hurrian Literatures. An Overview”, *CANE* 4, 2367–2377.
- , 2002. “Ea and the Beast. A Song Related to the Kumarpi Cycle”, in: P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Papers Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, 1–10.
- , 2007. “Transmission of Recitative Literature by the Hittites”, *AoF* 2, 185–203.
- Arrighetti, G. 1975. “Esiado fra epica e lirica”, in: G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Esiado: letture critiche*, Milan, 5–34.
- , 1989–1990. “Notte e i suoi figli: tecnica catalogica ed uso dell’aggettivazione in Esiado (*Th.* 211–223)”, *Annali per l’Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici* XI, 11–25 [= in: R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all’età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di B. Gentili*, vol. 1, Rome 1993, 101–114].

- , 1993. *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*. Pisa.
- , 1996. "Hésiode et les Muses: Le don de la vérité et la conquête de la parole", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 53–70 (= "Esiodo e le Muse: il dono della verità e la conquista della parola", *Athenaeum* 80, 1992, 45–63).
- , 1998. *Esiodo, Opere. Testi introdotti, tradotti e commentati*. Turin (repr. Milan 2007).
- , 2006. *Poesia, Poetiche e Storia nella riflessione dei Greci*. Pisa.
- , 2007. "Anekdoten und Biographie", in: M. Erler–S. Schorn (eds.), *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin–New York, 78–100.
- , 2008a. "Il Catalogo esiodico: un genere letterario?", in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *Esiodo. Cent'anni di papiri*, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Florence, 7–8 June 2007), Florence, 11–28.
- , 2008b. "Cameleonte peripatetico e gli studi sulla biografia greca", in: Arduini et al., (eds.), *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, Rome, vol. I, 63–69.
- Arthur, M. 1983. "The Dream of a World without Women: Poetics and the Circles of Order in the *Theogony* prooemium", *Arethusa* 16, 97–116.
- Ascheri, P. 2006. "Demetrius [14] Ixion", in: *LGGA*.
- Asquith, H. 2005. "From Genealogy to Catalogue: the Hellenistic Adaptation of the Hesiodic Catalogue Form", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 265–286.
- Athanassakis, A.N. 1992. "Introduction", in: A.N. Athanassakis (ed.), *Essays on Hesiod* 1, *Ramus* 21, 1–10.
- Auffarth, C. 1991. *Der drohende Untergang. "Schöpfung" in Mythos und Ritual im Alten Orient und in Griechenland am Beispiel der Odyssee und des Ezechielbuches*. Berlin.
- Auffarth, C.–Stuckenbrock, L. (eds.) 2003. *The Fall of the Angels*. Leiden.
- Avezzù, G. 1982. *Alcidamante, Orazioni e frammenti*. Rome.
- Bachvarova, M. 2005. "Relations between God and Man in the Hurro-Hittite Song of Release", *JAOS* 125, 1–13.
- , 2009. "Local word-smiths and supra-local audiences: Hittite perspectives", in: R. Hunter–I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge, 23–45.
- Baddeley, A. 1990. *Human Memory: Theory and Practice*. London.
- Bader, F. 1989. *La langue des dieux ou l'hermétisme des poètes indoeuropéens* (Testi linguistici vol. 14). Pisa.
- Bakker, E.J. 1999. "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer", in: J.N. Kazazis–A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart, 50–65.
- , 2001. "Similes, Augment, and the Language of Immediacy", in: J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, Leiden, 1–23.
- , 2002. "Remembering the God's Arrival", *Arethusa* 35, 63–81.
- , 2005. *Pointing at the Past. From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Washington.
- Ballabriga, A. 1998. "L'invention du mythe des races en Grèce archaïque", *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 215, 307–339.

- Barchiesi A. 1991. "Discordant Muses", *PCPhS* 37, 1–21.
- , 1994. *Il poeta e il principe. Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*. Rome-Bari.
- , 2004. "Quando Virgilio era un moderno: una delle più antiche recite delle *Georgiche*, e il contesto di una spiritosaggine", *MD* 52, 21–28.
- , 2005. *Ovidio. Metamorfosi. Libri I–II*. Milan.
- Barnett, R.D. 1945. "The Epic of Kumarbi and the Theogony", *JHS* 45, 100–101.
- Barra-Salzedo, E. 2007. *En soufflant la grâce. Âmes, souffles et humeurs en Grèce ancienne*. Grenoble.
- Barron, J.P.–Easterling, P.E. 1985. "Hesiod", in: P.E. Easterling–B.M.W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, I: Greek Literature*, Cambridge, 92–105.
- Bassett, S.E. 1917. "ΟΛΙΓΟΜΕΡΙΑ and ΠΟΛΥΜΕΡΙΑ", *CP* 12, 97–101.
- , 1923. "The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*", *AJP* 44, 339–348.
- Baumgarten, A.I. 1981. *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos. A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Bechtel, F. 1924. *Die griechischen Dialekte III: Der ionische Dialekt*. Berlin.
- Beckman, G. 2005. "Hittite and Hurrian Epic", in: J.M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, London, 255–263.
- Beckman, G. 1986. "Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Hittite", *JNES* 45, 19–30.
- Bellandi, F.–Berti, E.–Ciappi, M. 2001. *Iustissima Virgo. Il mito della Vergine in Germanico e in Avieno*. Pisa.
- Benardete, S. 1967. "Hesiod's *Works and Days*: A First Reading", *AGVN* 1, 150–174.
- Berenson Maclean, J.K.–Aitken, E.B. (eds.) 2001. *Flavius Philostratus, Heroikos*. Atlanta GA.
- Bernabé, A. 1979. *Textos literarios hititas*. Madrid.
- , 1988. "Un mito etiológico anatolio sobre el Tauro (CTH 16) en Nonno (*Dion.* 1.408 s.)", *Aula Orientalis* 6, 5–10.
- , 1989. "Generaciones de dioses y sucesión interrumpida. El mito hitita de Kumarbi, la *Teogonia* de Hesíodo y el Papiro de Derveni", *Aula Orientalis* 7, 159–179.
- , 1995. "Influences orientales dans la littérature grecque: quelques réflexions de méthode", *Kernos* 8, 9–22.
- , 2004. *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta Pars II—Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta Fasc. 1*. Leipzig.
- Betegh, G. 2004. *The Derveni Papyrus. Cosmology, Theology, and Interpretation*. Cambridge.
- Bettini M. 1979. *Studi e note su Ennio*. Pisa.
- Black, J.–Cunningham, G.–Robson, E.–Zólyomi, G. 2004. *The Literature of Ancient Sumer*. Oxford.
- Blaise, F. 1992. "L'épisode de Typhée dans la *Théogonie* d'Hésiode (v. 830–885): la stabilisation du monde", *RÉG* 105, 349–370.
- Blaise, F.–Rousseau, Ph. 1996. "La guerre (*Théogonie*, vv. 617–720)", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de La Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 213–233.

- Blam, J.-M. 2005. "Fragment Hittite Bo 7247: Nouveau joint avec le chant de LAMMA", (<http://antiquitatis-notae.univ-paris1.fr/blamfragka.pdf>).
- Blum, R. 1977. *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen*. Frankfurt (English transl.: *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. Madison IL, 1991).
- Blumenthal, A. von. 1942. "Beobachtungen zu griechischen Texten IV", *Hermes* 77, 103–111.
- Blümer, W. 2001. *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung: die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods*, 2 vols. Münster.
- Boedeker, D. 1983. "Hecate: A Transfunctional Goddess in the *Theogony*?", *TAPA* 113, 79–93.
- Bollack, J. 1971. "Mythische Deutung und Deutung des Mythos", in: M. Fuhrmann (ed.), *Terror und Spiel: Probleme der Mythenrezeption*, Munich, 111–118.
- Bona Quaglia, L. 1973. *Gli 'Erga' di Esiodo*. Turin.
- Bonnafé, A. 1985. *Eris et Eros. Mariages divins et mythe de succession chez Hésiode*. Lyon.
- Bonner, S. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. London.
- Bonnet, C. 1987. "Typhon et Baal Saphon", in: E. Lipinski (ed.), *Studia Phoenicia, V: Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the first millennium B.C.*, Leuven, 101–143.
- Borgeaud, Ph. 2004. *Exercices de mythologie*. Geneva.
- Boyce, M. 1975–1991. *A History of Zoroastrianism*, 3 vols. Leiden.
- Bradley, E.M. 1966. "The Relevance of the Prooemium in the Design and Meaning in Hesiod's *Theogony*", *SO* 41, 29–47.
- Braswell, B.K.–Billerbeck, M. 2007. *The Grammarian Epaphroditus. Testimonia and Fragments*. Bern–Berlin.
- Bray, D. 2000. "Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Indo-European Myth of the Final Battle", *JIES* 28, 359–371.
- Brellich, A.I. 1985. *Greci e gli dei*. Napoli.
- Bremmer, J.N. 2004. "Remember the Titans", in: Ch. Auffarth–L.T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Fall of the Angels. Themes in Biblical Narrative*, Leiden, 35–61.
- Brink, K.O. 1946. "Callimachus and Aristotle: an Inquiry into Callimachus' Πρὸς Προξενόνην", *CQ* 40, 11–26.
- Briquel, D. 1980. "La Théogonie d'Hésiode: essai de comparaison indo-européenne", *RHR* 197, 243–276.
- Broggiato, M. 2001. *Cratete di Mallo, I frammenti*. La Spezia–Rome.
- Bruss, J.S. 2004. "Lessons from Ceos: Written and Spoken Word in Callimachus", in: M.A. Harder–R.F. Regtuit–G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus II*, Leuven, 49–69.
- Buck, C.D. 1955. *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago IL.
- Bulloch, A.W. 1985. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.
- Burkert, W. 1979. "Von Ullikummi zum Kaukasus: Die Felsgeburt des Unholds. Zur Kontinuität einer mündlichen Erzählung", *WJA N.F.* 5, 253–261.
- , 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Cambridge MA–London.

- , 1993. "Kronia-Feste und ihr altorientalischer Hintergrund", in: S. Döpp (ed.), *Karnevalische Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*, Trier, 11–30.
- , 1994. "Orpheus, Dionysus und die Euneiden in Athen: das Zeugnis von Euripides' Hypsipyle", in: A. Bierl–P. von Möllendorff (eds.), *Orchestra. Drama, Mythos, Bühne*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, 44–49.
- , 2004. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis. Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*. Cambridge MA.
- Buzio C. 1938. *Esiado nel mondo greco sino alla fine dell'età classica*. Milan.
- Cairns, F. 2006. *Sextus Propertius. The Augustan Elegist*. Cambridge.
- Calabrese de Feo, M.R. 1995. "La duplice fisionomia di Pandora in Esiodo", in: G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Poesia Greca (Ricerche di Filologia Classica vol. 4)*, Pisa, 101–121.
- Calame, C. 1996. "Le proème des *Travaux* d'Hésiode: prélude à une poésie d'action", in: F. Blaise, –P. Judet de La Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 169–189.
- , 2001. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Function* (tr. D. Collins and J. Orion). Lanham MD.
- , 2006. *Pratiques poétiques de la mémoire: représentations de l'espace-temps en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.
- Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton NJ.
- Campanile, E. 1977. *Ricerche di cultura poetica indoeuropea*. Pisa.
- Campbell, M. 1981. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden.
- Canfora, L., 1955. "Le collezioni superstiti", in: G. Cambiano–L. Canfora–D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica II*, Rome 1995, 95–250.
- Canobbio, A. 2006. "Ennio e la danza delle Muse. Nota ad Ann. 1 SU," *RFIC* 134, 429–440.
- Cardin, M. 2009. "Heroogonia. Il *Catalogo delle donne* di Giovanni Tzetze", *Philologus* 153.
- Casanova, A. 1969. "Il mito di Atteone nel Catalogo esiodeo", *RFIC* 97, 31–46.
- , 1973. "Un frammento trascurato e il problema della divisione in libri del catalogo esiodeo", *SIFC* 45, 3–27.
- , 1979. "Catalogo, Eèe e Grandi Eèe nella tradizione ellenistica", *Prometheus* 5, 217–240.
- , 2008. "Cent'anni di papiri esiodei", in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *Esiado. Cent'anni di papiri, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi* (Florence, 7–8 June 2007), Florence, 1–10.
- Cassio, A.C. 1977. *Aristofane, Banchettanti*. Pisa.
- , 1993a. "Alcmane, il dialetto di Cirene e la filologia alessandrina", *RFIC* 121, 24–36.
- , 1993b. "Parlate locali, dialetti delle stirpi e fonti letterarie nei grammatici greci", in: E. Crespo–J.L. García Ramón–A. Striano (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega* (Miraflores de la Sierra [Madrid] 19–20 June 1991), Madrid, 73–90.
- , 1998. "Lo sviluppo dell'epica greca e il mondo euboico", in: M. Bats–B. d'Agostino (eds.), *Euboica. L'Eubea e la presenza euboica in Calcidica e in*

- Occidente*. Atti del Convegno di Napoli, 13–16 November 1996, *AION* 12, 11–22.
- , 2000. “Esametri orfici, dialetto attico e musica dell’Asia Minore”, in: A.C. Cassio–D. Musti–L.E. Rossi (eds.), *Synaulia. Cultura musicale in Grecia e contatti mediterranei*, *Ann. Ist. Orient. Napoli, Sez. filologico-letteraria* 5, 97–110.
- , 2005. “I dialetti eolici e la lingua della lirica corale”, in: F. Bertolini–F. Gasti (eds.), *Dialetti e lingue letterarie nella Grecia antica*, Atti della IV Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica, Pavia, 1–2 April 2004, Pavia, 13–44.
- Cassola, F. 1975. *Inni omerici*. Milan.
- Chantraine, P. 1958². *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.
- , 1968–1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
- Charles, R.H. 1913. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- Chatman, S. 1978. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structures in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca NY.
- Chuvin, P. 1991. *Mythologie et géographie dionysiaques: recherches sur l’oeuvre de Nonnus de Panopolis*. Clermont-Ferrand.
- Cingano, E. 2005. “A catalogue within a catalogue: Helen’s suitors in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women”, in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 118–152.
- , 2007. “Note a due frammenti ‘esiodei’ (Hes. fr. 199.3; 200.10 M.-W.)”, *QUCC* 114, 21–25.
- Civil, M. 1944. *Sumerian Agricultural Manual* (*Aula Orientalis* vol. 5). Barcelona.
- Claus, D. 1977. “Defining Moral Terms in the *Works and Days*”, *TAPA* 108, 73–84.
- Clausen, W. 1994. *Virgil’s Eclogues*. Oxford.
- Clauss, J.J. 1990. “Hellenistic Imitations of Hesiod *Catalogue of Women* fr. 1, 6–7 M.-W.”, *QUCC* 65, 129–139.
- Clay, D. 2004. *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*. Washington DC–Cambridge MA.
- Clay, J.S. 1984. “The Hecate of the Theogony”, *GRBS* 25, 27–38.
- , 1989. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton NJ.
- , 1993. “The Education of Perses: From ‘Mega Nepios’ to ‘Dion Genos’ and Back”, in: A. Schiesaro–Ph. Mitsis–J.S. Clay (eds.), *Mega Nepios: il destinatario nellepos didascalico*, Pisa, MD 31, 23–33.
- , 2003. *Hesiod’s Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- , 2005. “The beginning and end of the *Catalogue of Women* and its relation to Hesiod”, in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 25–34.
- , 2007. “Hesiod’s Rhetorical Art”, in: I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Malden MA, 447–457.
- Cohen, I.M. 1986. “The Hesiodic ‘Catalogue of Women’ and the ‘Megalai Ehoiai’”, *Phoenix* 40, 127–142.
- , 1989. “Traditional Language and the Women in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*”, *SCI* 10, 12–27.

- Colbeaux, M.-A. 2005. *Raconter la vie d'Homère dans l'antiquité. Édition commentée du traité anonyme "Au sujet d'Homère et d'Hésiode, de leurs origines et de leur joute" et de la "Vie d'Homère" attribué à Hérodote*. Diss. Université Charles de Gaulle–Lille III.
- Cole, T. 1983. "Archaic Truth", *QUCC* 13, 7–28.
- Collins, D. 2002. "Reading the birds: oionomanteia in early epic", *ColbyQ* 38, 17–41.
- , 2004. *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Washington DC–Cambridge MA.
- Colvin, S. 1999. *Dialect in Aristophanes*. Oxford.
- Conybeare, F.C.–Harris, J.R.–Lewis, A.S. 1898. *The Story of Ahikar: from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek, and Slavonic Versions*. London.
- Cornford, F.M. 1952. *Principium Sapientiae*. Cambridge.
- , 1950. "A Ritual Basis for Hesiod's Theogony", in: W.K.C. Guthrie, *The Unwritten Philosophy and Other Essays*, Cambridge, 95–116.
- Costa, C. 1968. "La stirpe di Ponto", *SMSR* 39, 61–100.
- Cottini, R.–Grotanelli, C. 2005. *Il saggio Ahikar: fortune e trasformazioni di uno scritto sapienziale: il testo più antico e le sue versioni*. Brescia.
- Crespo, M.-I. 2001. "En el laboratorio de Calímaco: metaliteratura y mitopoiesis en el *Himno a Zeus*", *Argos* 25, 25–44.
- Culler, J. 1997. *Literary Theory*. Oxford.
- D'Agostino, E. 2007 (ed.). *Onomacriti testimonia et fragmenta*. Pisa–Rome.
- D'Alessio, G.B. 2005a. "The Megalai Ehoiai: a survey of the fragments", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 176–216.
- , 2005b. "Ordered from the Catalogue: Pindar, Bacchylides and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry" in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, Cambridge, 217–238.
- Dalley, S. 2000. *Myths from Mesopotamia. Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford.
- Danek, G. 1998. *Epos und Zitat. Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*. Vienna.
- Davidson, O.M. 2001. "Some Iranian poetic tropes as reflected in the 'Life of Ferdowsi' traditions", in: M.G. Schmidt–W. Bisang (eds.), *Philologica et Linguistica: Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, Trier, 1–12.
- Davies, D.R. 1992. *Genealogy and Catalogue: Thematic Relevance and Narrative Elaboration in Homer and Hesiod*, Ph.D. dissertation (UMI). Michigan IL.
- Davies, M. 1989. *The Greek Epic Cycle*. London.
- Davison, J.A. 1968. *From Archilochus to Pindar*. New York.
- Debiasi, A. 2004. *L'Epica perduta*. Rome.
- , 2008. *Esiado e l'Occidente*. Rome.
- , 2009 (forthcoming). "Orcomeno, Ascre e l'epopea regionale 'minore'", in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tradizioni locali e generi letterari nella Grecia arcaica: epos minore, lirica ed elegia, storiografia*, Alessandria.
- Degl'Innocenti Pierini, R. 1980. *Studi su Accio*. Florence.
- Derrida, J., 1992. "The Strange Institution Called Literature", in: D. Attridge (ed.), *Acts of Literature*, London, 33–75.
- Detienne, M. 1967. *Les maîtres de vérité en Grèce archaïque*. Paris.

- , 1981. "Au commencement était le corps des dieux", preface to W.F. Otto, *Les dieux de la Grèce*, Paris [French translation of *Die Götter Griechenland. Das Bild des Göttlichen im Spiegel des griechischen Geistes*, Frankfurt am Main 1961].
- , 1994. *Les maîtres de vérité en Grèce archaïque*, revised ed., with a new preface: "En ouverture: retour sur la bouche de la Vérité", Paris, 5–31. (= *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece* (tr. J. Lloyd), New York 1996, 15–33).
- Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Oxford.
- Dickie, M. 1978. "Dike as a Moral Term in Homer and Hesiod", *CP* 73, 91–101.
- Di Gregorio, L. (ed.) 1975. *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam*. Milan.
- Dijkstra, M. 2006. "The myth of apsi 'the (sea)dragon' in the Hurrian tradition", *UF* 37, 315–328.
- Diller, H. 1946. "Hesiod und die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie", *Antike und Abendland* 2, 140–151.
- , 1962. "Die dichterische Form von Hesiods Erga", *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse*, Nr. 2, 41–69 (= Heitsch 1966, 239–274).
- Doherty, L. 2006. "Putting the Women Back into the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women", in: V. Zajko–M. Leonard (eds.), *Laughing with Medusa. Classical Myth and Feminist Thought*, Oxford, 297–326.
- Dornseiff, F. 1956. "Altorientalisches zu Hesiods Theogonie", in: F. Dornseiff (ed.), *Antike und Orient. Interpretationen (Kleine Schriften vol. 1)*, Leipzig, 35–60.
- Dougherty, C. 2001. *The Raft of Odysseus: the Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Dougherty-Glenn, C. 2006. *Prometheus*. London.
- Dräger, P. 1993. *Argo pasimelousa*. Stuttgart.
- , 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*. Stuttgart.
- Durante, M. 1971. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*. Rome.
- Düring, I. 1957. *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*. Göteborg.
- Dyck, A.R. 1988. *The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis* (Sammlung Griechischer und Lateinischer Grammatiker vol. 7), Berlin–New York.
- Edwards, A.T. 2004. *Hesiod's Ascra*. Berkeley CA.
- Edwards, G.P. 1971. *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*. Oxford.
- Effe, B. 1977. *Dichtung und Lehre. Untersuchungen zur Typologie des antiken Lehrgedichts*. Munich.
- Eissfeldt O. 1960. "Phönikische und griechische Kosmogonie", in: O. Eissfeldt (ed.), *Éléments orientaux dans le religion grecque ancienne*, Paris, 1–15.
- Erbse, H. 1969–1988. H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*, vols. I–VII. Berlin–New York.
- Ercolani, A. 2001. "Per una storia del testo esiodico. Hes. fr. 343 M.–W.", *Seminari Romani* 4, 181–215.
- Evelyn-White, H.G. 1924. "A Peisistratean Edition of the Hesiodic Poems", *CQ* 18, 142–150.
- Faber, R. 2000. "Vergil's 'Shield of Aeneas' (*Aeneid* 8.617–731) and the Shield of Heracles", *Mnemosyne* 53, 49–57.

- Fakas, C. 2001. *Der hellenistische Hesiod. Arats Phainomena und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik*. Wiesbaden.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2000. "Theocritus and the 'Demythologizing' of Poetry", in: M. Depew–D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*, Cambridge MA–London, 135–151.
- Fantuzzi, M.–Hunter, R. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Faraone, C. 2005. "Catalogues, Priamels, and Stanzaic Structure", *TAPA* 135, 249–265.
- Faraone, C.–Teeter, E. 2004. "Egyptian Maat and Hesiodic Metis", *Mnemosyne* 57, 177–208.
- Farrell, J. 1991. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic. The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York–Oxford.
- , (forthcoming). "Heroic Genealogies in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*".
- Fedeli, P. 2005. *Properzio. Elegie, Libro II*. Cambridge.
- Ferrari, F. 1992. *Introduzione a Omero*. Florence.
- Fick, A. 1887. *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.
- Finkelberg, M. 1991. "Royal Succession in Heroic Greece", *CQ* 41, 303–316.
- , 1998. *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Fletcher, K. 2006. "Review of R. Hunter, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 2005", *BMCR*. 2006-10-03.
- Fletcher, R. 2005. "Or such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* ...", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge, 299–319.
- Foley, J.M. 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington IN.
- Fontenrose, J. 1959. *Python*. Berkeley CA.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer. The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca–London.
- , 2002. *The Origins of Criticism*. Princeton NJ.
- Förster, E. 1936. "Eine Geschichte der Götterkönigtums aus dem Hatti-Reiche", in: *Mélanges F. Cumont*, *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, Brussels, 687–713.
- Forsdyke, J. (Sir). 1956. *Greece before Homer: Ancient Chronology and Mythology*. London.
- Foster, B.R. 2005³. *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. Bethesda MD.
- Fowler, D. 2000. "The Didactic Plot", in: M. Depew–D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge MA–London, 205–219.
- Fowler, R.L. 1998. "Genealogical Thinking: Hesiod's Catalogue and the Creation of the Hellenes", *PCPhS* 44, 1–19.
- Fränkel, H. [1968³] 1960. *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. Munich.
- , [1969³] 1962. *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*. Munich.
- Frankfort, H. 1948. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago IL.

- Fraser, P.M.–Matthews, E. 2000. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. III B. *Central Greece from the Megarid to Thessaly*. Oxford.
- Frazer, R.M. 1981. "Hesiod's Titanomachy as an Illustration of Zielinski's Law", *GRBS* 22, 5–9.
- Friedländer, P. 1913. ΥΠΟΘΗΚΑΙ. *Hermes* 48, 558–616.
- , 1914. "Das Proömium von Hesiods Theogonie", *Hermes* 49, 1–16 (= Heitsch 1966, 277–294).
- Friedländer, P.–Hoffleit, H.B. 1948. *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*, London–Berkeley.
- Führer, R.–Schmidt, M. 2001. "Homerus redivivus" [on Homerus, *Ilias*, rec. M.L. West, vol. I, Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae 1998], *GGA* 253, 1–32.
- Fuss, W. 1910. *Versuch einer Analyse von Hesiods ERGA KAI HMERA I* (1. Theil). Borna-Leipzig.
- Gagarin, M. 1973. "Dike in the *Works and Days*", *CP* 68, 81–94.
- , 1974. "Hesiod's Dispute with Perses", *TAPA* 104, 103–111.
- , 1990. "The Ambiguity of Eris in the *Works and Days*", in: M. Griffith–D.J. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses. Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of T.G. Rosenmeyer*, Atlanta GA, 173–183.
- Gale, M. 1994. *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge.
- , 2000. *Virgil on the nature of things: the Georgics, Lucretius, and the didactic tradition*. Cambridge.
- Gantz, T. 1996. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore–London.
- Garcia Trabazo, J.V. 2002. *Textos religiosos hititas*. Madrid.
- Gatz, B. 1967. *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*. (*Spudasmata* vol. 16). Hildesheim.
- Geffcken, J. 1927. "Ein Prinzip antiker Erzählungs- und Darstellungskunst", *Hermes* 62, 1–23.
- Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse*, transl. by J.E. Lewin. Oxford.
- George, A.R. 2003. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, vols. 1–2. Oxford.
- Giangrande, G. 1970. "Der stilistische Gebrauch der Dorismen im Epos", *Hermes* 98, 257–275.
- Gibson, B.J. 2006. *Statius Silvae* 5. Oxford.
- Gibson, R.K. 2003. *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 3*. Cambridge.
- Gigon, O. 1945. *Der Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie*. Basel.
- Giordano, D. 1990. *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae Fragmenta, iteratis curis commentarioque instr.* D. G. Bologna.
- Giorgieri, M. 2001. "Die hurritische Fassung des Ullikummi-Lieds und ihre hethitischen Parallelen", in: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie. Würzburg. 4.-8. Oktober 1999* [StBoT 45], Wiesbaden, 134–155.
- Göttling, C. 1843². *Hesiodi Carmina*. Göttingen.
- Gottschalk, H.B. 1980. *Heraclides of Pontus*. Oxford.
- Graf, F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte*. Rome.
- Grandolini, S. 1991. *Manuelis Moschopouli Commentarium in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*. Rome.
- Graziosi, B. 2002. *Inventing Homer. The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge.

- Green, P. 1984. "Works and Days 1–285: Hesiod's Invisible Audience", in: H.D. Evjen (ed.), *Mnemei: Classical Studies in Memory of Karl K. Hulley*, Chico CA, 21–39.
- Griffin, J. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer", *JHS* 97, 39–53.
- Griffith, M. 1983. "Personality in Hesiod", *CA* 2, 37–65.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1960. "The Flight of the Gods Before Typhon. An Unrecognised Myth", *Hermes* 88, 374–376.
- Grimal, P. 1962. "Tibulle et Hésiode", in: *Hésiode et son influence, (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, vol. 7)*, Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 271–287.
- Gudeman, A. 1934. *Aristoteles: Poetik*. Berlin.
- Guillon, P. 1963. *Le Bouclier d'Héraclès et l'histoire de la Grèce centrale dans la période de la première guerre sacrée*. Aix-en-Provence.
- Gurney, O. 1977. *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion*. Oxford.
- Güterbock, H.G. 1946. *Kumarbi. Mythen vom churritischen Kronos aus den hethitischen Fragmenten zusammengestellt, übersetzt und erklärt*. Zurich-New York.
- Haas, V. 1976. "Die Unterwelts- und Jenseitsvorstellungen im hethitischen Kleinasien", in: *Orientalia* NS 45, 197–212.
- , 1980. "Betrachtungen zum ursprünglichen Schauplatz der Mythen vom Gott Kumarbi", *Studi mycenaei ed egeo-anatolici* 22, 97–105.
- , 1982. *Hethitische Berggötter und hurritische Steindämonen. Riten, Kulte und Mythen. Eine Einführung in die altkleinasiatischen religiösen Vorstellungen*. Mainz.
- , 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden.
- , 2002. "Der Schicksalstein", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 29, 234–237.
- , 2003. "Betrachtungen zu CTH 343, einem Mythos des Hirschgottes", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 30, 296–303.
- , 2006. *Die hethitische Literatur: Texte, Stilistik, Motive*. Berlin-New York.
- Haas, V.-Wilhelm, W. 1974. *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna* [Alter Orient und Altes Testament Sonderreihe 3], Kevelaer: Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Haider, P.W. 2005. "Von Baal Zaphon zu Zeus und Typhon: zum Transfer mythischer Bilder aus dem vorderorientalischen Raum in die archaisch-griechische Welt", in: R. Rollinger (ed.), *Von Sumer bis Homer: Festschrift für Manfred Schretter zum 60. Geburtstag am 25. Februar 2004*, Münster, 303–337.
- Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Halliwell, S. 1986. *Aristotle's Poetics*. London.
- Hamilton, R. 1989. *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry*. Baltimore-London.
- Hanfmann, G.M.A. 1958. "Lydiaka", *HSCP* 63, 65–88.
- Hansen, P.A. 1983. *Carmina epigraphica Graeca saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.* Berlin-New York.
- Harder, M.A. 1988. "Callimachus and the Muses: Some Aspects of Narrative Technique in *Aetia* 1–2", *Prometheus* 14, 1–14.
- , 2003. "The Invention of Past, Present and Future in Callimachus' *Aetia*", *Hermes* 131, 290–306.

- , 2004. "Callimachus", in: I.J.F. de Jong–R. Nünlist–A. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden, 63–81.
- Hardie, P. 1986. *Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- , 2000. "Pindar's 'Theban' Cosmogony (The First Hymn)", *BICS* 44, 19–40.
- , 2005. "The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Latin Literature", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 287–298.
- Haubold, J. 2002. "Greek Epic: a Near Eastern genre?", *PCPhS* 48, 1–19.
- , 2005. "Heracles in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 85–98.
- Häussler, R. 1976. *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil*. Heidelberg.
- Heath, M. 1985. "Hesiod's Didactic Poetry", *CQ* 35, 245–263.
- Heidegger, M. 1950. *Holzwege*, transl. by A. Hofstadter. Frankfurt.
- Heiden, B. 2007. "The Muses' Uncanny Lies: Hesiod, *Theogony* 27 and its Translators", *AJP* 49, 153–175.
- Heilingner, K. 1983. "Der Freierkatalog der Helena im hesiodeischen Frauenkatalog", *MH* 40, 19–34.
- Heitsch, E. 1966. *Hesiod. (Wege der Forschung vol. 44)*. Darmstadt.
- Helck, W. 1983. "Zur Herkunft der Erzählung des sog. 'Astartepapyrus'", in: M. Görg (ed.), *Fontes atque Pontes. Eine Festgabe für Hellmut Brunner*, Wiesbaden, 215–223.
- Heldmann, K. 1982. *Die Niederlage Homers im Dichterwettstreit mit Hesiod. (Hypomnemata vol. 75)*. Göttingen.
- Hendel, R. 2003. "The Nephilim were on the Earth: Genesis 6: 1–4 and its Ancient Near Eastern Context", in: C. Auffarth–L. Stuckenbrock (eds.), *The Fall of the Angels*, Leiden, 11–34.
- Henrichs, A. 1993. "Gods in Action. The Poetics of Divine Performance in the *Hymns of Callimachus*", in: M.A. Harder–R.F. Regtuit–G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus*, Groningen, 127–147.
- Heubeck, A. 1954. *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias*. Erlangen.
- , 1979. *Schrift. Archaeologia Homerica*, vol. III (X). Göttingen.
- Heydenreich, T. 1970. *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt. Das Nachleben eines antiken Themas in den romanischen Literaturen*. Heidelberg.
- Heyworth, S.J. 2004. "Looking into the River: Literary History and Interpretation in Callimachus, *Hymns* 5 and 6", in: M.A. Harder–R.F. Regtuit–G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus II*, Leuven, 139–159.
- Hirschberger, M. 2004. *Gynaikôn Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai. Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*. Munich–Leipzig.
- Hoekstra, A. 1957. "Hésiode et la tradition orale", *Mnemosyne* 10, 193–225.
- Hoffner, H. 1998². *Hittite Myths*. Atlanta GA.
- , 1968. "Hittite tarpis and Hebrew teraphim", *JNES* 27, 61–68.
- Hofinger, M. 1975. *Lexicon Hesiodeum*. Leiden.
- Hofmann, H. 1971. "Hesiod Theogonie V. 35", *Gymnasium* 78, 90–97.
- Hollis, A.S. 1977. *Ovid Ars Amatoria, Book 1*. Oxford.

- Hölscher, U. 1990. *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*. Munich.
- Holford-Stevens, L. 1998 *Aulus Gellius*. London.
- Hooke, S.H. 1960. *Myth Ritual and Kingship: Essays in Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and Israel*. Oxford.
- Hopkinson, N. 1984. *Callimachus Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge.
- Hornung, T. 1982. *Der Ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen*. Göttingen.
- Houwink ten Cate, P. 1961. *The Luvian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera During the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden.
- How, W.W.–Wells, J. 1912 (rev. 1928). *A Commentary on Herodotus*, vols. I–II. Oxford.
- Hunter, R. 1997. “Longus and Plato” in: M. Picone–B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*, Basel, 15–28 (= Hunter [2008b] 775–789).
- , (ed.) 2005a. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge.
- , 2005b. “The Hesiodic Catalogue and Hellenistic Poetry”, in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 239–265 (= Hunter [2008b] 470–502).
- , 2006a. “Sweet nothings—Callimachus fr. 1, 9–12 revisited”, in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *Callimaco: cent'anni di papiri*, Florence, 119–131 (= Hunter [2008b] 523–536).
- , 2006b. *The Shadow of Callimachus*. Cambridge.
- , 2007. “Sappho and Latin poetry”, in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *I papiri di Saffo e di Alceo*, Florence, 213–225.
- , 2008a. “Hesiod, Callimachus, and the invention of morality”, in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *Esiado. Cent'anni di papiri*, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Florence, 7–8 June 2007), Florence, 153–164 (= Hunter [2008b] 559–571).
- , 2008b. *On Coming After. Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception*. Berlin–New York.
- , 2009. “The Trojan Oration of Dio Chrysostom and Ancient Homeric criticism”, in: J. Grethlein–A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature (Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes 4)*, Berlin–New York.
- , forthcoming. “The reputation of Callimachus”, in: D. Obbink–R. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces*, Oxford (= Hunter [2008b] 537–558).
- Hunter, R.–Führer, Th. 2002. “Imaginary Gods? Poetic Theology in the *Hymns of Callimachus*”, in: *Callimaque, (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, vol. 48), Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres–Geneva, 143–175 (= Hunter [2008b] 405–433).
- Hutchinson, G.O. 2003. “The Aetia: Callimachus’ Poem of Knowledge”, *ZPE* 145, 47–59.
- Huxley, G.L. 1969. *Greek Epic Poetry From Eumelos to Panyassis*. London.
- Irwin, E. 2005. “Gods among men? The social and political dynamics of the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women”, in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 35–84.

- Jacob, Chr. 1994. "L'ordre généalogique. Entre le mythe et l'histoire", in: M. Detienne (ed.), *Transcrire les mythologies. Tradition, écriture, historicité*, Paris, 169–202.
- Jacobsen, T. 1984. *The Harab Myth*. Malibu CA.
- Jacoby, F. 1930. *Hesiodi Carmina*. Pars I. *Theogonia*. Berlin.
- Jaeger, W. 1934. *Paideia*, vol. I, Berlin.
- Jaillard, D. 2007. *Configurations d'Hermès. Une 'théogonie hermaïque'*. (Kernos Supplément 17). Liège.
- Janda, M. 2001. "Tracce indoeuropee nel mito di Ullikummi", in: O. Carruba (ed.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, 193–203.
- Janko, R. 1981. "The structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre", *Hermes* 109, 9–24.
- , 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*. Cambridge.
- , 1984. "P. Oxy. 2509: Hesiod's *Catalogue* on the Death of Actaeon", *Phoenix* 38, 299–307.
- , 1986. "The *Shield of Heracles* and the Legend of Cycnus", *CQ* 36, 38–59.
- , 1992. *The Iliad: Commentary. Vol. IV: Books 13–16*. Cambridge.
- , 2000a. "On *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M.L. West, vol. I, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1998", *CR* 50, 1–5.
- , 2000b. *Philodemus. On Poems Book I*, Oxford.
- Jocelyn, H.D. 1979. "Vergilius cacozelus (Donatus Vita Vergilii 44)", *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 2, 67–142.
- Jones, N.F. 1984. "Work 'In Season' in the Works and Days", *CJ* 79, 307–323.
- Jong, I.J.F. de 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- , 2004. "Homer", in: de Jong–Nünlist–Bowie 2004, 13–24.
- Jong, I.J.F. de–Nünlist, R. (eds.). 2007. *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*. (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative vol. 2), Leiden.
- Jong, I.J.F. de–Nünlist, R.–Bowie, A. 2004. *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative vol. 1), Leiden.
- Judet de la Combe, P. 1993. "L'autobiographie comme mode d'universalisation. Hésiode et l'Hélicon", in: G. Arrighetti (ed.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, Pisa, 25–39.
- , 1996. "La dernière ruse: 'Pandore' dans la *Théogonie*", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 263–299.
- Judet de la Combe, P.–Lernould, A. 1996. "Sur la 'Pandore' des *Travaux*. Esquisses", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 301–313.
- Kahane, A. 2005. *Diachronic Dialogues: Authority and Continuity in Homer and the Homeric Tradition*. Lanham MD.
- Kaiser, O. 1969. "Gerechtigkeit und Heil bei den israelitischen Propheten und griechischen Denkern des 8.–6. Jahrhunderts", *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 11, 312–328.
- Kambylis, A. 1965. *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius*. Heidelberg.

- Kassel, R. 1985. "Antimachos in der Vita Chisiana des Dionysios Periegetes", in: *Catalepton, Festschrift B. Wyss*, Basel, 69–76.
- Kassel, R.–Austin, C. 2001. *Poetae Comici Graeci I: Comoedia Dorica, Mimi, Phlyaces*. Berlin–New York.
- Katz, J. 1998. "How to be a dragon in indo-european: Hittite Illuyankas and its Linguistic and Cultural Congeners in Latin, Greek and Germanic", in: J. Jasanoff–C. Melchert–L. Oliver (eds.), *Muir Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck, 317–334.
- Kelly, A. 2007. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII*. Oxford.
- Kennedy, G.A. 1957. "The ancient dispute over rhetoric in Homer", *AJP* 78, 23–35.
- Kerschensteiner, J. 1944. "Zum Aufbau und Gedankenführung von Hesiods *Erga*", *Hermes* 79, 149–191.
- Kilmer, A.D. 1972. "The Mesopotamian Concept of Overpopulation and its Solution as Reflected in the Mythology", *Orientalia* 41, 160–177.
- Kirchhoff, A. 1889. *Hesiodos' Mahnlieder an Perses*. Berlin.
- Kirk, G. 1970. *Myth. Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Societies*. Cambridge.
- , 1985. *The Iliad. A Commentary*, Vol. I: Books 1–4. Cambridge.
- Kirk, G.S.–Raven, J.E.–Schofield, M. 1983. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge.
- Koch, K. 1993. "Hazzi-Safon-Kasion", in: B. Janowski–K. Koch–G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, Freiburg, 171–223.
- Koenen, L. 1994. "Greece, the Near East and Egypt: Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the *Catalogue of Women*", *TAPA* 124, 1–34.
- Kolsti, J. 1990. *The Bilingual Singer. A Study in Albanian and Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic Traditions* (ed. by Albert B. Lord), Harvard Dissertations in Folklore and Oral Tradition. New York–London.
- Komornicka, A. 1990. "L'Elpis hésiodique dans la jarre de Pandore", *Eos* 78, 63–77.
- Konstan, D. 1998. "The Dynamics of Imitation. Callimachus' First Iambic", in: M.A. Harder–R.F. Regtuit–G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, Groningen, 133–142.
- Körte, A. 1929. "Χαοκτῆρ", *Hermes* 64, 69–86.
- Koster, S. 1970. *Antike Epostheorien*. Wiesbaden.
- Krajczynski, J.–Rösler, W. 2006. "Die Substanz der Hoffnung: zum Pandora-Mythos in Hesiods *Erga*", *Philologus* 150, 14–27.
- Kranz, W. 1961. "Sphragis. Ich-form und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotiv antiker Dichtung", *RhM* 104, 3–46 & 97–124.
- Krischer, T. 1965. "ΕΤΥΜΟΣ und ΑΛΗΘΗΣ", *Philologus* 109, 161–174.
- Kristiansen, K.–Larsson, T.B. 2005. *The Rise of Bronze Age Society*. Cambridge.
- Kubusch K., 1986. *Aurea Saecula: Mythos und Geschichte. Untersuchung eines Motivs in der antiken Literatur bis Ovid*. Frankfurt a.M.–Bern–New York.
- Kümmel, H.M. 1967. *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König* [= STB 5]. Wiesbaden.

- Kurke, L. 1993. "The Economy of Kudos", in: C. Dougherty-L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, Cambridge, 131-163.
- Labate M., 2005. "Tempo delle origini e tempo della storia in Ovidio", in: J.P. Schwindt (ed.), *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne—Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung*, Heidelberg, 177-201.
- Laird, A. 2002. "Authority and Ontology of the Muses in Epic Reception", in: E. Spentzou-R. Fowler (eds.), *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Oxford, 117-140.
- Laks, A. 1996. "Le double roi. Remarques sur les antécédents hésiodiques du philosophe-roi", in: F. Blaise-P. Judet de la Combe-Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 83-91.
- Lambert, W.-Walcot, P. 1965. "A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod", *Kadmos* 4, 64-72.
- Lambert, W.G. 1960. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford.
- , 1978. *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*. London.
- Lamberton, R. 1988. *Hesiod*. New Haven-London.
- Landolfi, L. 1996. *Il volo di Dike. Da Arato a Giovenale*. Bologna.
- , 2003. *Integra prata. Manilio, i proemi*. Bologna.
- Lane-Fox, R. 2008. *Travelling Heroes. Greeks and their myths in the epic age of Homer*. London.
- Lanza, D. 2005. "Le dimore degli dei omerici", *QUCC* 80, 11-24.
- La Penna, A. 1962. "Esiòdo nella cultura e nella poesia di Virgilio", in: *Hésiode et son influence, (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, vol. 7)*, Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 213-252.
- , 1963. *Orazio e l'ideologia del principato*. Turin.
- , 1979. "L'usus contro Apollo e le Muse. Nota a Ovidio, *Ars. am.* 1, 25-30", *ASNP* s. III, 9, 985-997.
- , 1985. "Esiòdo", in: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. II, Rome, 386-388.
- Laroche, E. 1968. "Textes mythologiques Hittites en transcription. Deuxième partie. Mythologie d'origine étrangère", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 26, 5-84.
- Larson, S. 2000. "Boiotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the *Odyssey's* Catalogue of Heroines", *GRBS* 41, 193-222.
- Latacz, J. 2002. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar*, vol. I.2, Munich-Leipzig.
- Latimer, J.F. 1930. "Perses versus Hesiod", *TAPA* 61, 70-79.
- Latte, K. 1968. "Hesiods Dichterweihe", in: id., *Kleine Schriften*, Munich, 60-75 [= *Antike und Abendland* 2, 1946, 152-163].
- Lauriola, R. (2000). "Elpis e la giara di Pandora (Hes. *Op.* 90-104): il bene e il male nella vita dell'uomo", *Maia* 52, 9-18.
- Lazaridis, N. 2007. *Wisdom in Loose Form: the Language of Egyptian and Hellenistic Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Leiden.
- Lebrun, R. 1995. "From Hittite Mythology: The Kumarbi Cycle", *CANE* 3, 1971-1980.
- Leclerc, M.-C. 1978. "Le mythe hésiodique entre le silence et les mots", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 194.1, 3-22.

- , 1992. "L'épervier et le rossignol d'Hésiode: Une fable à double sens", *RÉG* 105, 37–44.
- , 1993. *La parole chez Hésiode. À la recherche de l'harmonie perdue*. Paris.
- , 1994. "Facettes du temps dans les *Travaux et les Jours* d'Hésiode", *RPh* 68, 147–163.
- Ledbetter, G. 2003. *Poetics before Plato*. Princeton–Oxford.
- Lejeune, M. 1972². *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Lenz, A. 1975. "Hesiods Prozesse", in: *Dialogos für Harald Patzer zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden.
- , 1980. *Das Proem des frühen griechischen Epos: ein Beitrag zum poetischen Selbstverständnis*. Bonn.
- Leo, F. 1894. *Hesiodica*, Index Scholarum, Gottingae, 1–22 (= *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, Rome 1960, vol. II, 343–363).
- Leroux, D. 2007. *Astronomy, Weather and Calendars in the Ancient World. Parapegmata and Related Texts in Classical and Near-Eastern Societies*. Cambridge.
- Leumann, M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*. Basel.
- Levet, J-P. 1976. *Le vrai et le faux dans la pensée grecque archaïque: étude de vocabulaire*. Paris.
- Lichtheim, M. 1996. "Didactic Literature", in: A. Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, Leiden, 243–262.
- , 1983. *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context. A Study of Demotic Instructions*. Göttingen.
- Littleton, C.S. 1970. "The Kingship in Heaven Theme", in: J. Puhvel (ed.), *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans*, Los Angeles CA, 83–121.
- Livadaras, N. 1963. *Ιστορία της παραδόσεως τοῦ κεμένον τοῦ Ἡσιόδου*. Athens.
- Livrea, E. 1966. "Il proemio degli Erga considerato attraverso i vv. 9–10", *Helikon* 6, 442–475.
- , 1967. "Applicazione della 'Begriffsspaltung' negli Erga", *Helikon* 7, 81–100.
- Löffler, A. 1963. *Die Melampodie. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des Inhalts*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Long, A.A. 1992. "Stoic Readings of Homer", in: R. Lamberton–J.J. Keaney (eds.), *Homer's Ancient Readers. The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*, Princeton, 41–66 (= id., *Stoic Studies*, Cambridge 1996, 58–85).
- Lonsdale, S.H. 1989. "Hesiod's Hawk and Nightingale (*Op.* 202–212): Fable or Omen?", *Hermes* 117, 403–412.
- Lopez-Ruiz, C.S. 2006. "Some Oriental Elements in Hesiod and the Orphic Cosmogonies", *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 6, 71–104.
- Lorau, L. 1978. "Sur la race des femmes et quelques-unes de ses tribus", *Arethusa* 11, 43–87.
- Lord, A.B. 1960. (2000², intr. S. Mitchell–G. Nagy [vii–xxix]). *The Singer of Tales*. (= *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature* vol. 24), Cambridge MA.
- Lyons, D. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult*. Princeton NJ.
- Lowe, N.J. 2000. *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*. Cambridge.

- Luzzatto, M.J. 1992. "Grecia e Vicino Oriente: tracce della storia di Ahiqar nella cultura greca tra VI e V secolo a. C.", *QS* 18, 5–84.
- , 1994. "Ancora sulla storia di Ahiqar", *QS* 20, 253–277.
- Maes, M. 1939. *Contribution à l'étude du commentaire de Plutarque aux Travaux et Jours d'Hésiode*. Liège.
- Mahlow, G.H. 1926. *Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung*. Berlin.
- Mallory, J.P.–Adams, D. 1997. *Encyclopaedia of Indo-European Culture*. London.
- Manakidou, F. 2006a. "Ιχνηλατώντας τα Έργα και Ημέραι", in: N. Bezantakos–Ch. Tsagalis (eds.), *Μουσάων Αρχώμεθα. Ο Ησίοδος και η αρχαϊκή επική ποίηση*, Athens, 257–394.
- , 2006b. "Autour de la structure des Travaux et les Jours d'Hésiode: la 'dualité' du cosmos hésiodique", *Gaia* 10, 149–167.
- Mancini, M. 1986. "Semantica di ἔητός e ἄρητος nel prologo agli Έργα di Esiodo", *AIVN* 8, 175–191.
- Mandler, G.–Dean, P. 1969. "Seriation: Development of Serial Order in Free Recall", *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 81, 207–215.
- March, J. 1987. *The Creative Poet*. London.
- Marckscheffel, G. 1840. *Hesiodi, Eumeli, Cinaethonis, Asii et Carminis Naupactii fragmenta*. Lipsiae.
- Marcotte, D. 1988. "Héros divinisés et simulacres dans le catalogue hésiodique des femmes", *AC* 57, 249–257.
- Marcotte, D.–Mertens, P. 1994. "Catalogue des Femmes et Grandes Éoés d'Hésiode. Liste, description et bibliographie fondamentale des fragments papyrologiques (= MP³ 508–531.2)", in: *Storia poesia e pensiero nel mondo antico. Studi in onore di M. Gigante*, Naples, 407–423.
- Marg, W. 1970. *Hesiod*. Zurich–Munich.
- Mariotti, S. 2001³. *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio*. Bologna.
- Marsilio, M. 1997. "The poetics of Hesiod's Winter", *ASNP* 4.1 2 (2), 411–425.
- , 2000. *Farming and Poetry in Hesiod's Works and Days*. Lanham–New York–Boston.
- Martano, A. 2002. "Scolii e glosse allo Scudo di Eracle dal manoscritto Ambrosiano C 222 Inf.", *Aevum* 76, 151–200.
- , 2004a. "Hieronymus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου", in: W.W. Fortenbaugh–S. White (eds.), *Lycos of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes*, New Brunswick–London, 457–474.
- , 2004b. "Brevi note a P.Oxy. 4652", *Aegyptus* 84, 129–136.
- , 2005a. "La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo Scudo di Eracle esiodico. La famiglia del Vat. gr. 1332 (sec. XIII–XV)", *Aevum* 78, 461–489.
- , 2005b. "La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo Scudo di Eracle esiodico. I codici Vat. Pal. gr. 425, Vallicell. F 16, Leid. Vulc. gr. 23, Laur. Conv. Soppr. 158 e Par. gr. 2833 (sec. XIV–XVI)", *Aevum* 80, 461–489.
- , 2006. "L'esegesi antica allo Scudo di Eracle nell'Etymologicum Genuinum e Gudianum", in: G. Avezzi–P. Scattolin (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*, Atti Conv. Rovereto 20 ottobre 2006, Rovereto, 85–120.

- Martin, R. 1942–1943. “The Golden Age and the ΚΥΚΛΟΣ ΓΕΝΕΣΕΩΝ (Cyclical Theory) in Greek and Latin Literature”, *G&R* 12, 62–71.
- Martin, R.P. 1984. “Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes”, *TAPA* 114, 29–48.
- , 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca, NY.
- , 1992. “Hesiod’s Metanastic Poetics”, in: A.N. Athanassakis (ed.), *Essays on Hesiod*, *Ramus* 21, 11–33.
- , 2000. “Synchronic Aspects of Homeric Performance: The Evidence of the *Hymn to Apollo*,” in: A.M. González de Tobia (ed.), *Una nueva visión de la cultura griega antigua hacia el fin del milenio*, La Plata, 403–432.
- , 2005. “Pulp Epic: the *Catalogue* and the *Shield*”, in: R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 153–175.
- Martinazzoli, F. 1946. “Lo sdoppiamento di alcuni concetti morali in Esiodo e la Elpis”, *SIFC* 21, 11–22.
- Marzillo, P. 2009. *Der Kommentar des Proklos zu Hesiods Werken und Tagen*. Tübingen.
- Masaracchia, A. 1961. “L’unità delle Opere esiodee e il loro rapporto con la *Teogonia*”, *Helikon* 1, 217–244.
- Massa Positano, L. 1971. “Il proemio degli Erga”, in: *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio De Falco*, Naples, 27–56.
- Massimilla, G. 1996. *Callimaco Aitia. Libri primo e secondo. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Pisa.
- Masson, E. 1991. *Le combat pour l’immortalité: héritage indo-européen dans la mythologie anatolienne*. Paris.
- Mayer, W.R. 1987. “Ein Mythos von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs”, *Orientalia* 56, 55–68.
- Mazon, P. 1928 (1986¹²). *Hésiode. Théogonie, Les Travaux et les Jours, le Bouclier*. Paris.
- Mazzoli, G. 1970. *Seneca e la poesia*. Milan.
- McKay, K.J. 1962. *Erysichthon. A Callimachean Comedy*. Leiden.
- McLennan, G.R. 1977. *Callimachus Hymn to Zeus*. Rome.
- McNelis, Ch. 2002. “Greek Grammarians and Roman Society during the Early Empire: Statius’ Father and his Contemporaries”, *CA* 21, 67–94.
- Meeks, D.–Favard-Meeks, C. 1997. *Daily Life of the Egyptian Gods*. London.
- Meier, W.D. 1976. *Die epische Formel im pseudohesiodeischen Frauenkatalog. Eine Untersuchung zum nachhomerischen Formelgebrauch*. Zurich.
- Meliadò, C. 2003. “Un nuovo frammento esiodico in uno scolio a Teocrito”, *ZPE* 145, 1–5.
- Meltzer, E.S. 1974. “Egyptian Parallels for an Incident in Hesiod’s Theogony and an Episode in the Kumarbi Myth”, *JNES* 33, 154–157.
- Merkelbach, R. 1950. “ΠΕΙΡΙΘΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΣΙΣ”, *SIFC* 24, 255–263.
- , 1956. “Konjekturen zu Hesiod”, *SIFC* 27–28, 286–301.
- , 1957. *Die Hesiodfragmente auf Papyrus*. Leipzig.
- , 1968. “Les papyrus d’Hésiode et la géographie mythologique de la Grèce”, *CE* 43, 133–155.

- Merkelbach, R.–West, M.L. 1965. "The Wedding of Ceyx", *RhM* 108, 300–317.
 —, 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford.
- Meyer, D. 2005. *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen* (= *Hermes Einzelschriften* vol. 93). Stuttgart.
- Meyer, E. 1966. "Hesiod's Erga und das Gedicht von den fünf Menschengeschlechtern", in: E. Heitsch (ed.), *Hesiod (Wege der Forschung* vol. XLIV), Darmstadt, 471–522 [= id., *Kleine Schriften* II, Halle, 1924, 15–66].
- Mezzadri, B. 1989. "La double Éris initiale", *Métis* 4, 51–60.
- Mickey, K. 1981. "Dialect Consciousness and Literary Language: an Example from Ancient Greek", *TPhS* 79.1, 35–66.
- Millett, P. 1984. "Hesiod and his World", *PCPhS* 210, 84–115.
- Minchin, E. 2001. *Homer and the Resources of Memory. Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Mineur, W.H. 1984. *Callimachus Hymn to Delos*. Leiden.
- Minton, W.W. 1962. "Invocation and catalogue in Hesiod and Homer", *TAPA* 93, 188–212.
- Miralles, C. 1933. "Le spose di Zeus e l'ordine del mondo nella *Teogonia* di Esiodo", in: M. Bettini (ed.), *Maschile/Femminile. Generi e ruoli nelle culture antiche*, Rome–Bari, 17–44.
- Mondi, R. 1984. "The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*", *GRBS* 25, 325–344.
 —, 1986. "Tradition and Innovation in the Hesiodic Titanomachy", *TAPA* 116, 26–48.
 —, 1990. "Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East", in: L. Edmunds (ed.), *Approaches to Greek Myth*, Baltimore–London, 142–198.
- Montanari, F. 1979. *Studi di filologia omerica antica. I* (*Biblioteca di Studi Antichi* vol. 19). Pisa.
 —, 1989. CPF I 1*, 403–418 (Chamaeleon).
 —, 1998. "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer", in: G.W. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts—Texte Edieren, (Aporemata* vol. 2), Göttingen, 1–21.
 —, 2000a. "Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature", in: W.W. Fortenbaugh–E. Schütrumpf (eds.), *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*, (Rutgers Univ. St. in Class. Humanit. vol. IX), New Brunswick–London, 391–411.
 —, 2000b. "Ripensamenti di Aristarco sul testo omerico e il problema della seconda ekdosis", in: *Poesia e religione in Grecia, Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, Naples, 479–486.
 —, 2002. "Alexandrian Homeric Philology. The Form of the Ekdosis and the variae lectiones", in: M. Reichel–A. Rengakos (eds.), *Epea Pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung, Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, 119–140.
 —, 2003. "I percorsi della glossa. Traduzioni e tradizioni omeriche dall'antichità alla cultura bizantina", in: Paola Volpe Cacciatore (ed.), *Erudizione scolastico-grammaticale a Bisanzio*, Naples, 81–88.
 —, 2004. "La filologia omerica antica e la storia del testo omerico", in: A. Bierl–A. Schmitt–A. Willi (eds.), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung, Festschrift für Joachim Latacz*, Munich, 127–143.

- , 2008. "Aristotele, Zenodoto, Aristarco e il serpente pietrificato di Iliade II 319", in: *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, Rome, 237–244.
- , 2009. "Ekdosis alessandrina: il libro e il testo", in: M. Sanz Morales–M. Librán Moreno (eds.), *Verae Lectiones. Estudios de Crítica Textual y Edición de Textos Griegos*, Cáceres–Huelva, forthcoming.
- Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*. Chicago IL.
- Morau, P. 1951. *Les Listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote*. Louvain.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1964. "'Doric' Features in the Language of Hesiod", *Glotta* 42, 138–165.
- Most, G. 1992. "Il poeta nell'Ade: catabasi epica e teoria dell'epos tra Omero e Virgilio", *Atti del IX Congresso della Federazione internazionale delle Associazioni di Studi Classici = SIFC* 3:10, 1014–1026.
- , 1993. "Hesiod and the Textualization of personal Temporality", in: G. Arrighetti (ed.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, Pisa, 73–91.
- , 1997. "Hesiod's Myth of the Five (or Three or Four) Races", *PCPhS* 43, 104–127.
- , 2006–2007. *Hesiod I: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia; II: The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*, vols. 2. Cambridge MA–London.
- Mülke, Ch. 2002. *Solons politische Elegien und Iambi*. Munich–Leipzig.
- Müller, M. 1891. *De Seleuco Homérico*. Diss. Göttingen.
- Muellner, L. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in the Iliad*. Ithaca NY.
- Munding, H. 1960. "Die gute und die böse Eris", *Gymnasium* 67, 409–422.
- Murnaghan, S. 2006. "Farming, Authority, and Truth-Telling in the Greek Tradition", in: R.M. Rosen–I. Sluiter (eds.), *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden–Boston, 93–118.
- Murray, P. 1981. "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece", *JHS* 101, 87–101.
- Musäus, I. 2004. *Der Pandoramythos bei Hesiod und seine Rezeption bis Erasmus von Rotterdam*. Göttingen.
- Myers, S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes. Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor MI.
- Nagler, M. 1992. "Discourse and Conflict in Hesiod: Eris and the Erides", in: A. Athanassakis (ed.), *Essays on Hesiod* 1, *Ramus* 21, 79–96.
- Nagy, G. 1972. "Introduction, Parts I and II, and Conclusions", in: F.W. Householder–G. Nagy (eds.), *Greek: A Survey of Recent Work*, The Hague, 17–70, 15–72.
- , 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge MA.
- , 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore–London.
- , 1982. "Hesiod", in: T.J. Lucey (ed.), *Ancient Authors*, New York, 43–73.
- , 1985. "Theognis of Megara: A Poet's Vision of His City", in: T.J. Figueira–G. Nagy (eds.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, Baltimore MD, 22–81.
- , 1990a. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore MD.

- (<http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/nagy/PHTL/toc.html>) (1997).
- , 1990b. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca NY.
- , 1992. "Authorisation and Authorship in the Hesiodic *Theogony*", in: A.N. Athanassakis (ed.), *Essays on Hesiod 2*, *Ramus* 21, 119–130.
- , 1996a. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge.
- , 1996b. *Homeric Questions*. Austin TX.
- , 1996c. "Autorité et auteur dans la *Théogonie* hésiodique", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de La Combe–P. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Paris, 41–52.
- , 1997. "Homeric Scholia", in: I. Morris–B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden–New York–Cologne, 101–122.
- , 1998. "Aristarchean Questions", *BMCR* 1998.07.14.
- , 1999. "Les éditions alexandrines d'Homère au XVIIIe et au XIXe siècle", in: F. Létoublon–C. Volpilhac–Auger (eds.), *Homère en France après la Querelle (1715–1900)*, Paris, 63–72.
- , 2000. "On *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M.L. West, vol. I, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1998", *BMCR* 2000.09.12.
- , 2001. "The Sign of the Hero: A Prologue", in: J.K. Berenson Maclean–E.B. Aitken (eds.), *Flavius Philostratus Heroikos: Writings from the Greco-Roman World*, Atlanta GA, xv–xxxv.
- , 2002. *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*. Cambridge MA–Athens.
- , 2003. *Homeric Responses*. Austin TX.
- , 2004a. "Laède épique en auteur: la tradition des Vies d'Homère", in: C. Calame–R. Chartier (eds.), *Identités d'auteur dans l'Antiquité et la tradition européenne*, Grenoble, 41–67.
- , 2004b. "Transmission of Archaic Greek Symptotic Songs: From Lesbos to Alexandria", *Critical Inquiry* 31, 26–48.
- , 2005. "The Epic Hero", in: J.M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Oxford, 71–89. (http://chs.harvard.edu/publications.sec/online_print_books.ssp/gregory_nagy_the_epic/bn_u_tei.xml_5).
- , 2006. "Homer's Name Revisited", in: G.-J. Pinault–D. Petit (eds.), *La langue poétique indo-européenne* (Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes [Indogermanische Gesellschaft/Society for Indo-European Studies], Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003; Collection linguistique de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, vol. 91), Leuven–Paris, 317–330.
- , 2008a. *Homer the Classic*. Washington DC–Cambridge MA.
- , 2008b. *Greek: Toward an Updating of a Survey of Recent Work*. Washington DC–Cambridge MA (updating of Nagy 1972).
- , 2009. *Homer the preclassic*. Berkeley–Los Angeles CA.
- Naiden, F. 2003. "The words of the Alewife at line 42 of Hesiod's Works and Days", *JNES* 62, 263–266.
- Nardelli, J.-F. 2001. "On *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M.L. West, vol. II, Munich–Leipzig 2000", *BMCR* 2001.06.21.
- , 2001–2002. "Editer l'Iliade I. La trasmission et ses débats: perspectives critiques", *Gaia* 5, 41–118; "Editer l'Iliade II. Manuscrits et affiliations manuscrites dans l'Iliade XIII–XV", *Gaia* 6, 47–144.

- Nasta, M. 2006. "La typologie des catalogues d'Éhées: un réseau généalogique thématisé", *Kernos* 19, 59–78.
- Neils, J. 2005. "The Girl in the Pithos: Hesiod's *Elpis*", in: J. Barringer–J. Hurwit (eds.), *Periklean Athens and its Legacy: Problems and Perspectives*, Austin TX, 37–45.
- Neitzel, H. 1975. *Homer-Rezeption bei Hesiod. Interpretation ausgewählter Passagen*. Bonn.
- , 1976. "Pandora und das Faß: Zur Interpretation von Hesiod, Erga 42–105", *Hermes* 104, 387–419.
- Nelson, S.A. 1997. "The Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale", *CJ* 92, 235–247.
- , 1998. *God and the Land: The Metaphysics of Farming in Hesiod and Vergil*. Oxford.
- , 2005. "Hesiod", in: J.M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Malden MA–Oxford, 330–343.
- Neu, E. 1996. *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I* [StBoT 32]. Wiesbaden.
- Nickau, K. 1972. "Zenodotos", *RE* X A, 19–49.
- , 1977. *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*. Berlin–New York.
- Nicolai, W. 1964. *Hesiod's Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau*. Heidelberg.
- Nietzsche, Fr. 1870/1873. "Der Florentinische Traktat über Homer und Hesiod, ihr Geschlecht und ihren Wettkampf", *RhM* 25, 528–540/28, 211–249.
- , 1871. *Certamen quod dicitur Homeri et Hesiodi post Henricum Stephanum denuo ed. Fr. N.* (= *Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis* 1, 1–23). Leipzig.
- Nikitinski, O. 2006. *Kallimachos-Studien*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1951. "The Sickles of Kronos", *ABSA* 46, 122–124.
- Nisbet, R.G.M.–Hubbard, M. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M.–Rudd, N. 2004 *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*. Oxford.
- Nishimura-Jensen, J. 2000. "Unstable Geographies: The Moving Landscape in Apollonius' *Argonautica* and Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*", *TAPA* 130, 287–317.
- Nünlist, R. 1998. *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*. Stuttgart–Leipzig.
- , 2004. "Hesiod", in: de Jong–Nünlist–Bowie 2004, 25–34.
- , 2007. "Hesiod", in: de Jong–Nünlist 2007, 39–52.
- , 2009. "Narratological Concepts in Greek Scholia", in: J. Grethlein–A. Renfakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. (*Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes* 4), Berlin, 63–83.
- Obbink, D. 1993. "The Addressees of Empedocles", in: A. Schiesaro–Ph. Mitsis–J. Strauss Clay (eds.), *Mega Nepios: il destinatario nell' epos didascalico*, *MD* 31, Pisa, 51–98.
- , 2003. "4648. Prose on star-signs quoting Homer, Hesiod, and others", in: N. Gonis–D. Obbink–P.J. Parsons (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 68, London, 52–63.

- , 2004. "Vergil's *De pietate*: from *Ehoiae* to Allegory in Vergil, Philodemus, and Ovid", in: D.J. Armstrong-Fish-P.A. Johnston-M.B. Skinner (eds.), *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*, Austin TX, 175–209.
- O'Brien, S.T. 1976. "Indo-European Eschatology: a Model", *JIES* 4, 295–332.
- O'Bryhim, S. 1996. "A New Interpretation of Hesiod 'Theogony' 35", *Hermes* 124, 131–138.
- Oettinger, N. 1989–1990. "Die 'dunkle Erde' im Hethitischen und Griechischen", *Die Welt des Orients* 20/21, 83–98.
- Ogden, D. 1996. "What was in Pandora's Box?", in: N. Fisher-H. van Wees (eds.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, Swansea, 213–230.
- Osborne, R. 2005. "Ordering Women in Hesiod's *Catalogue*", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 5–24.
- Otto, E. 1969. "Das 'Goldene Zeitalter' in einem Ägyptischen Text", in: P. Derchain (ed.), *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine*, Paris, 93–108.
- Pache, C.O. 2004. *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece*. Urbana-Chicago IL.
- Pagani, L. 2006. "Megaclides", in: *LGGA*.
- , 2008. "Dionysius [14] Thrax", in: *LGGA*.
- Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford 1955.
- Pagès, J. Cebrián 2005. "Análisis del escolio D a Ilíada I 5: una aproximación a la génesis del corpus", in: A. Alvar Ezquerra (ed.), *Actas del XI Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, Santiago de Compostela 2003*, Madrid, 453–460.
- Paivio, A. 1986. *Mental Representations: A Dual Coding Approach*. New York.
- Palmer, L.R. 1980. *The Greek Language*. London.
- Papathomopoulos, M. 1980. *Nouveaux fragments d'auteurs anciens*. Athens.
- Parke, H.W.–Wormell, D.E.W. 1956. *The Delphic Oracle*. Oxford.
- Parker, S.B. 1997. *Ugaritic Narrative Texts*. Atlanta GA.
- Parry, A. 1971. (ed.) *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Oxford.
- Pascucci, G. 1997. "Esiodo", in: *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, vol. II, Rome, 29–31.
- Pavese, C.O. 1981. "Poesia ellenica e cultura orale", in: C. Brillante-M. Cantilena-C.O. Pavese (eds.), *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*, Padua, 231–262.
- , 1995. *I poemi epici rapsodici come poemi orali e indipendenti*, *Atene e Roma* 40, 1–21.
- , 1998. "The Rhapsodic Epic Poems as Oral and Independent Poems", *HSCP* 98, 63–90.
- Pavese, C.O.–Venti, P. 2000. *A Complete Formular Analysis of the Hesiodic Poems. Introduction and Formular Edition*. Amsterdam.
- Pearson, B. 1999. "Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans: ἡ γῆ τῶν ἄσεβων in LXX Isaiah 26.19", in: S.E. Porter-M. A. Hayes-D. Tombs (eds.), *Resurrection*, Sheffield, 33–51.
- Pecchioli-Daddi, F.–Polvani, A.M. 1990. *La mitologia ittita*. Brescia.
- Pelliccia, H. 1995. *Mind, body, and speech in Homer and Pindar*. Göttingen.
- Pellizer E., 1972. "Metremi proverbiali nelle 'Opere e i giorni' di Esiodo", *QUCC* 13, 24–37.

- , 1975. "Per l'unità dei 'Giorni'", in: *Studi triestini di antichità in onore di L.A. Stella*, Trieste, 169–182.
- Perpillou, J.P. 1996. *Recherches Lexicales en grec ancien*. Leuven–Paris.
- Pertusi, A. 1955. (ed.) *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*. Milan.
- Peters, M. 1986. "Zur Frage einer 'achäischen' Phase des griechischen Epos, in *O-o-pe-ro-si*", in: A. Etter (ed.), *Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, Berlin–New York, 303–319.
- , 1987. Review of G. Danek, *Studien zur Dolonie* (Vienna 1988), *Die Sprache* 33, 233–242 (*Indogermanische Chronik* 33, G 30).
- Petrakis, I.E. 2003. *Η πρόσληψη των Έργων και Ημερών του Ησιόδου από τους μεταγενέστερους πεζογράφους (5ος αι. π.Χ. – 3ος αι. μ.Χ.) και τους σχολιαστές*. Thessaloniki.
- Petropoulos, J.C.B. 1994. *Heat and Lust: Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited*. Lanham–Boulder–New York–Oxford.
- Pettinato, G. 1971. *Das altorientalische Menschenbild und die sumerischen und akkadischen Schöpfungsmythen*. Heidelberg.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1965. *Callimachus. Vol. I: Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- , 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- Pfister, F. 1928. "Die Hekate-Episode in Hesiod's Theogonie", *Philologus* 84, 1–15.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2001. "Prairie d'Aphrodite et jardin de Pandore. Le 'féminin' dans la Théogonie", in: E. Delruelle–V. Pirenne Delforge (eds.), *Kēpoi. De la religion à la philosophie. Mélanges offerts à André Motte*, (Kernos Supplément vol. 11), Liège, 83–99.
- Pironti, G. 2007. *Entre ciel et guerre. Figures d'Aphrodite en Grèce ancienne*. (Kernos Supplément vol. 18). Liège.
- Pöhlmann, E. 1973. "Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts", *ANRW* 1.3, 813–901.
- , 1989. "Dichterweihe und Gattungswahl", in: A.E. Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex: Beiträge zur augusteischen Dichtung. Festschrift für Walter Wimmel zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, 247–260.
- Polvani, A.M. 2003. "Hittite Fragments on the Atrahasis Myth", in: P. Marrassini et al. (eds.), *Semitic and Assyriological Studies Presented to P. Fronzaroli*, Wiesbaden, 532–539.
- Pontani, F. 2000. "Catullus 64 and the Hesiodic Catalogue: a Suggestion", *Philologus* 144, 267–276.
- , 2005. *Eraclito, Questioni omeriche sulle allegorie di Omero in merito agli dèi*, Pisa.
- Popko, M. 1995. *Religions of Asia Minor*. Warsaw.
- Powell, I.U. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford.
- Pratt, L. 1993. *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*. Ann Arbor MI.
- Preller, L. 1842. *De Praxiphane peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili disputatio*, diss. Dorpati 1842 (= id., *Ausgewählte Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Berlin 1864).
- Pretagostini, R. 1995. "L'incontro con le Muse in Esiodo e in Callimaco: modificazioni di un modello", *Lexis* 13, 157–172.

- Prioux, E. 2007. *Regards alexandrins. Histoire et théorie des arts dans l'épigramme hellénistique*. Leuven.
- Pucci, P. 1977. *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*. Baltimore MD.
- , 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and in the Iliad*. Ithaca NY.
- , 1996. "Auteur et destinataires dans les Travaux d'Hésiode", in: F. Blaise-P. Judet de la Combe-Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 191–210.
- , 2005. "Prométhée, d'Hésiode à Platon", *Communications* 78, 51–70.
- , 2007. *Inno alle Muse (Esiado Teogonia 1–115)*. Rome-Pisa.
- Puelma, M. 1972. "Sänger und König: Zum Verständnis von Hesiods Tierfabel", *MH* 29, 86–109.
- , 1989. "Der Dichter und die Wahrheit in der griechischen Poetik von Homer bis Aristoteles", *MH* 46, 65–100.
- Puhvel, J. 1987. *Comparative Mythology*. Baltimore MD.
- Race, W.H. 1982. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Leiden.
- , 1992. "How Greek Poems Begin", *YCS* 29, 13–38.
- Radermacher, L. 1951. *Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)*, Vienna.
- Ramnoux, C. 1987. "Les femmes de Zeus: Hésiode: 'Théogonie', vers 885 à 955", in: A. Adler-B. d'Agostino-M. Augé et al. (eds.), *Poikilia. Études offertes à J.P. Vernant*, Paris, 155–164.
- Reinsch-Werner, H. 1976. *Callimachus Hesiodicus. Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene*. Berlin.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1924–1925. "Altgriechische Theologie und ihre Quellen", (*Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* vol. 4), Leipzig 1–19 (= Heitsch 1966, 532–544).
- , 1931. "Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos", in: *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein zum 2. April 1931 dargebracht*, Leipzig, 23–69.
- Rengakos, A. 2002. "On M.L. West, *Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich-Leipzig 2001", *BMCR* 2002.11.15.
- , 2004. "Die Argonautika und das 'kyklische Gedicht'. Bemerkungen zur Erzähltechnik des griechischen Epos", in: A. Bierl-A. Schmitt-A. Willi (eds.), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung. Festschrift J. Latacz*, Munich-Leipzig, 277–304.
- Richardson, N.J. 1981. "The contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidas", *Mouseion*, *CQ* 31, 1–10.
- Richardson, S. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville TN.
- Ricketts, M.L. 1965. "The North American Indian Trickster", *History of Religions* 5, 327–350.
- Riedinger, J.-C. 1992. "Structure et signification du 'Calendrier du Paysan' d'Hésiode (*Travaux* vv. 383–617)", *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 66, 121–141.
- Risch, E. 1984. "Der kyprische Akkusativ Plural kijonaus" in: *Athlon. Satura grammatica in honorem Fr. R. Adrados*, Madrid, 423–430.
- Ritchie, W. 1964. *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*. Cambridge.
- Rix, H. 1998. *LIV = Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.

- Robert, C. 1905. "Zu Hesiods Theogonie", in: *Mélanges Nicole*, Geneva, 461–487 (= Heitsch 1996, 153–174).
- , 1914. "Pandora", *Hermes* 49, 17–38.
- Robertson, N. 1980. "Heracles' 'Catabasis'", *Hermes* 108, 274–300.
- , 1984. "The ritual background of the Erysichthon story", *AJP* 105, 369–408.
- Rosen, R. 1990. "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*", *CA* 9, 99–113.
- , 1997. "Homer and Hesiod", in: I. Morris–B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden, 463–488.
- Rossi, L.E. 1978. "Il mondo Omerico. I poemi omerici come testimonianza di poesia orale", in: Bianchi Bandinelli Ranuccio (ed.), *Storia e Civiltà dei Greci*, vol. I.1, Milan, 73–147.
- , 1997. "Esiodo, Le opere e i giorni: un nuovo tentativo di analisi", in: F. Montanari–S. Pittaluga (eds.), *Posthomerica I*, Genova, 7–22.
- Roth, P. 2004. "Apollonios Rhodios zwischen Homer und Hesiod: Beobachtungen zum Argonautenkatalog", in: M. Janka (ed.), *Enkyklion kepon (Rundgärtchen). Zu Poesie, Historie und Fachliteratur der Antike. Festschrift für Hans Gärtner*, Munich, 43–54.
- Rousseau, Ph. 1993. "Un Héritage disputé", in: G. Arrighetti–F. Montanari (eds.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario: Atti del Convegno Pisa, 16–17 maggio 1991*, Pisa, 41–72.
- , 1996. "Instruire Persès: Notes sur l'ouverture des *Travaux d'Hésiode*", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 93–167.
- Rousseau, Ph.–Blaise, F. 1996. "La guerre, (*Théogonie* vv. 617–720)", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 213–233.
- Rudhardt, J. 1971. *Le thème de l'eau primordiale dans la mythologie grecque*. Bern.
- , 1981. "Le Mythe hésiodique des races et celui de Prométhée: Recherche de structures et des significations", in: J. Rudhardt (ed.), *Du mythe de la religion grecque et de la compréhension d'autrui*, (*Cahiers Vilfredo Pareto. Revue européenne des sciences sociales* vol. 19), 245–281.
- , 1993. "À propos de l'Hécate hésiodique", *MH* 50, 204–213.
- , 1996. "Le préambule de la *Théogonie*. La vocation du poète. Le langage des Muses", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 25–39.
- Russell, D.A. 1964. *'Longinus' On the Sublime*. Oxford.
- Russo, C.F. [1965²] 1950. *Hesiodi Scutum*. Florence.
- Rüter, K. 1969. *Odysseeinterpretationen. Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch und zur Phaiakis*. Göttingen.
- Rutherford, I. 2000. "Formulas, Voice, and Death in *Ehoie*-Poetry, the Hesiodic *Gunaikon Katalogos*, and the Odyssean *Nekuia*", in: M. Depew–D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge MA.
- , 2001. "The Song of the Sea (SA A-AB-BA SIR³). Thoughts on KUB 45.63", in: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. International Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999*, Wiesbaden, 598–609.

- , 2005. "Mestra at Athens: Hesiod fr. 43 and the poetics of panhellenism", in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 99–117.
- , (forthcoming). "Prophecy in the Kingship of Heaven Cycle: the Greek Reception of Ea and the Beast".
- Rzach, A. 1875–1876. "Der Dialekt des Hesiodos", *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband 8, 355–466.
- , 1902. *Hesiodus Carmina*. Leipzig.
- , 1912. "Hesiodos", *RE* VIII 1, 1167–1240.
- , 1924. "Kerkops", *RE* Suppl. IV, 901–902.
- Saintillan, D. 1996 (= 1966). "Du festin à l'échange: les grâces de Pandore", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le metier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 315–348.
- Salonen, A. 1968. *Agricultura Mesopotamica*. Helsinki.
- Salvini, M.–Wegner, I. 2004. *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler. I. Abteilung die Texte aus Bogazköy. Bd. 6. Die mythologischen Texte*. Rome.
- Sammons, B. 2007. *Homeric Catalogue: Tradition, Paradigm and the Limits of Narrativity*, Ph.D. dissertation (NYU). New York.
- Samuel, A.E. 1966. "The Days of Hesiod's Month", *TAPA* 97, 421–429.
- Schiesaro, A. 1996. "Aratus' Myth of Dike", *MD* 37, 9–26.
- Schmidt, J.-U. 1986. *Adressat und Paraineseform: Zur Intention von Hesiods 'Werken und Tagen'* (= *Hypomnemata* vol. 86), Göttingen.
- , 1988/1989. "Die Aufrichtung der Zeusherrschaft als Model. Überlegungen zur Theogonie des Hesiod", *WJA* 14, 39–68, and 15, 17–37.
- Schmidt, M. 1854. *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici alexandrini fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Schmidt, M. 1997. "Variae lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?", *ZPE* 115, 1–12.
- , 2002. "The Homer of the Scholia: what is explained to the reader?", in: F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del Congresso di Genova 6–8 luglio 2000*, Rome, 159–183.
- Schmid, W.–Stählin, O. 1929. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur I*. Munich.
- Schmitt, R. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
- Schmitz, T.A. 1999. "'I Hate All Common Things.' The Reader's Role in Callimachus' *Aetia* Prologue", *HSCP* 99, 151–178.
- Schmitzer, U. 2000. *Velleius Paterculus und das Interesse an der Geschichte im Zeitalter des Tiberius*. Heidelberg.
- Schmoll, E.A. 1994. "Hesiod's *Theogony*: Oak and Stone Again", *Scholia* 3, 46–52.
- Schoemann, G.Fr. 1857. "De Titanibus Hesiodicis", in: G.Fr. Schoemann (ed.), *Opuscula Academica*, vol. 2: *Mythologica et Hesiodica*, Berlin, 93–124.
- Schroeder, C.M. 2006. "Hesiod and the Fragments of Alexander Aetolus", in: M.A. Harder–R.F. Regtuit–G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Beyond the Canon*, Leuven, 287–301.
- Schroeder, Ch.M. 2007. "A new monograph by Aristarchus?", *JHS* 127, 138–141.
- Schuol, M. 2004. *Hethitische Kultmusik* (Orient-Archäologie vol. 14). Rhaden/Westfalen.

- Schütrumpf, E. 2008. *Heraclides of Pontus. Texts and Translation*, (trans. by E.S., P. Stork, J. van Ophuijsen and S. Prince), RUSCH-Rutg. Univ. Stud. Clss. Human. XIV, New Brunswick-London.
- Schwabl, H. 1960. "Griechischen Theogonien und der Orient", in: O. Eissfeldt (ed.), *Éléments orientaux dans le religion grecque ancienne*, Paris, 39-56.
- , 1966. *Hesiods Theogonie. Eine unitarische Analyse*. Vienna.
- , 1970. "Hesiod", *RE Suppl.* 12, 434-486.
- , 1986. "Vorbedingungen griechischer Philosophie in der frühen Dichtung", in: H. Koskeniemi-S. Jäkel-V. Pikko (eds.), *Literatur und Philosophie in der Antike*, Turku, 19-33.
- Schwartz, J. 1960. *Pseudo-Hesiodaia. Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'oeuvres attribuées à Hésiode*. Leiden.
- Schwemer, D. 2001. *Wettergottgestalten. Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen*. Wiesbaden.
- Schwinge, E.R. 1974. "Theokrits Dichterweihe (Id. 7)", *Philologus* 118, 40-58.
- Schwyzer, E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik. I. Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich.
- Schwyzer, E.-Debrunner, A. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik. II. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich.
- Scodel, R. 1980. "Hesiod Redivivus", *GRBS* 21, 301-320.
- Sellschopp, I. 1966. *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*, (Diss. Hamburg 1934), Darmstadt.
- Semanoff, M. 2006. "Pedagogy in Aratus' *Phaenomena*", in: M.A. Harder-R.F. Regtuit-G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Beyond the Canon*, Leuven, 303-317.
- Setaioli, A. 1988. *Seneca e i Greci. Citazioni e traduzioni nelle opere filosofiche*. Bologna.
- Seybold, K.-von Ungern-Sternberg, J. 1993. "Amos und Hesiod. Aspekte eines Vergleichs", in: K. Raafaub (ed.), *Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike*, Munich, 215-239.
- Shapiro, H.A. 1984. "Herakles and Kyknos", *AJA* 88, 523-529.
- , 1985. "Herakles, Kyknos and Delphi", in: H.A.G. Brijder (ed.), *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, Amsterdam, 271-274.
- Silván Rodríguez, A. 2002. "El mito de Tifón y su recepción en Píndaro", *CGC* 12, 145-161.
- Sinclair, T.A. 1927. "The so-called Peisistratean Edition of Hesiod", *CQ* 21, 195-198.
- Sistakou, E. 2005. *Ἡ γεωγραφία τοῦ Καλλιμάχου καὶ ἡ νεωτερικὴ ποίηση τῶν ἐλληνιστικῶν χρόνων*. Athens.
- Skempis, M.-Ziogas, I. 2009. "Arete's Words: Etymology, *Ehoie*-Poetry and Gendered Narrative", in: J. Grethlein-A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Form in Ancient Narrative Literature (Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes 4)*, Berlin-New York, 213-240.
- Slater, W.J. 1986. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, (*Sammlung Griechischer und Lateinischer Grammatiker* vol. 6) Berlin-New York.
- Smith, M. 2000. "P. Carsberg 462. A Fragmentary Account of a Rebellion Against the Sun God", in: P.J. Frandsen-K. Ryholt (eds.), *The Carlsberg Papyri 3. A Miscellany of Demotic Texts and Studies*, Copenhagen, 95-112.

- Smith, P. 1980. "Hesiod and the Individual in Hesiod's Myth of Five Races", *CW* 74, 145–163.
- Solmsen, F. 1949. *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. New York.
- , 1954. "The 'Gift' of Speech in Homer and Hesiod", *TAPA* 85, 1–15.
- , 1963. "The 'Days' of the *Works and Days*", *TAPA* 94, 293–320.
- , 1982. "The Earliest Stages in the History of Hesiod's Text", *HSCP* 86, 1–31.
- , 1989. "The Two Near Eastern Sources of Hesiod", *Hermes* 117, 413–422.
- , 1990.³ *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum*. Oxford.
- Sorel, R. 1982. "Finalité et origine des hommes chez Hésiode", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 87, 24–30.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, O. 1997. "The Hesiodic Myth of the Five Races and the Tolerance of Plurality in Greek Mythology", in: O. Palagia (ed.), *Greek Offerings on Greek Art in Honour of John Boardman*, Oxford, 1–21.
- Soysal, O. 2004. "On Hittite (LÚ) ANT—'The Equal One' Rival' Again", *JANER* 4, 99–105.
- Spentzou, E.—Fowler, D. 2002. (eds.) *Cultivating the Muse*. Oxford.
- Stein, E. 1990. *Autorbewußtsein in der frühen griechischen Literatur* (= *Scripta Oralia* vol. 17). Tübingen.
- Steiner, D. 2005. "Nautical Matters: Hesiod's Nautilia and Ibycus fr. 282 PMG", *CP* 100, 347–354.
- Steinmetz, P. 1986. "Allegorische Dichtung und allegorische Deutung in der alten Stoa", *RhM* 129, 18–30.
- Stephens, S. 2003. *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley–Los Angeles CA.
- Stiewe, K. 1962. "Die Entstehungszeit der hesiodischen Frauenkataloge I", *Philologus* 106, 291–299.
- , 1963. "Die Entstehungszeit der hesiodischen Frauenkataloge II", *Philologus* 107, 1–29.
- Stoddard, K. 2004. *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod* (= *Mnemosyne Supplement* vol. 255). Leiden–Boston.
- Stokes, M.C. 1962. "Hesiodic and Milesian Cosmogonies", *Phronesis* 7, 1–37.
- Stroh, W. 1976. "Hesiods lügende Musen", in: H. Görgemanns–E.A. Schmidt (eds.), *Studien zum antiken Epos*, Heidelberg, 85–112.
- Stroppa, M. 2008. "Esegesi a Esiodo nei papiri", in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *Esiodo. Cent'anni di papiri*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Florence, 7–8 June 2008, 83–96.
- Stuckenbruck, L.T. 2003. "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6: 1–4 in the Second and Third Centuries BCE", in: Ch. Auffarth–L.T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Fall of the Angels. Themes in Biblical Narrative*, Leiden, 87–118.
- Suerbaum, W. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter*. Hildesheim.
- Svenbro, J. 1976. *La parole et le marbre: aux origines de la poésie grecque*. Lund.
- Tandy, D.W.–Neale, W.C. 1996. *Hesiod's Works and Days: A Translation and Commentary for the Social Sciences*. Berkeley CA.
- Tavernini, N. 1953. *Dal libro decimo dell'Institutio Oratoria alle fonti tecnico-metodologiche di Quintiliano*. Turin.

- Thalmann, W.G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic*, Baltimore–London 1984.
- Thomson, J.A.K. 1914. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. I. Phonology*, Berlin–New York.
- Thumb, A. 1932. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I*, rev. by E. Kieckers, Heidelberg.
- , 1959. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, 2. rev. by A. Scherer, Heidelberg.
- Toohy, P. 1988. “An (Hesiodic) danse macabre: The *Shield of Heracles*”, *ICS* 12, 19–35.
- , 1996. *Epic Lessons. An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*. London.
- Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. 1969. “Eine Invektive gegen Hesiod bei Ovid”, in: J. Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, Brussels, vol. I, 728–750.
- Treu, M. 1957. “Das Proömium der hesiodischen Frauenkataloge”, *RhM* 100, 169–186.
- Troxler, H. 1964. *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*, Diss. Zurich.
- Trüb, H. 1952. *Kataloge in der griechischen Dichtung*. Oberwinterhur.
- Trumpf, J. 1958. “Stadtgründung und Drachenkampf (Exkurse zu Pindar, Pythien 1)”, *Hermes* 86, 129–157.
- Tsagalis, C. 2006a. “Poet and Audience: From Homer to Hesiod”, in: F. Montanari–A. Rengakos (eds.), *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire, (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, vol. 52)*, Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres–Geneva, 79–130.
- , 2006b. “Ποίηση και ποιητική στην *Θεογονία* και στα *Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι*”, in: N. Bezzantakos–C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Μουσάων Ἀρχώμεθα: ο Ησίοδος και η αρχαϊκή επική ποίηση*, Athens, 139–255.
- , 2007. “The Metaphor of Sailing and the *athlon* of Song: Reconsidering the *Nautilia* in Hesiod's *Works and Days*”, in: M. Paizi–Apostolopoulou–A. Rengakos–C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Ἀθλα και ἐπαθλα στα ομηρικά ἔπη*, Ithaki, 269–295.
- Turner, E.G.–Parsons, P.J. 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Second Edition Rev. and Enlarged by P.J. Parsons, *BICS Suppl.* 46, London.
- van Brock, N. 1959. “Substitution Rituelle”, *RHA* 17/65, 117–126.
- van Groningen, B.A. 1946. “The Poems of the Iliad and the Odyssey”, *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde N.R.* 9, 8, 279–294.
- van Thiel, H. 1992. “Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere”, *ZPE* 90, 1–32.
- , 1997. “Der Homertext in Alexandria”, *ZPE* 115, 13–36.
- Vasta, E. 2004. *Esiado Teogonia. Introduzione di Ettore Cingano. A cura di Eleonora Vasta*. Milan.
- Verdenius, W.J. 1962. “Aufbau und Absicht der *Erga*”, in: *Hésiode et son influence, (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, vol. 7)*, Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres–Geneva, 111–159.
- , 1972. “Notes on the Proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*”, *Mnemosyne* 25, 225–260.
- , 1985. *A Commentary on Hesiod Works and Days vv. 1–382*. Leiden.

- Vernant, J.-P. 1963. "Sur le vieux de la mer chez Hésiode", *RÉG* 76, 17–18.
- , 1983. *Myth and Thought Among the Greeks*. London.
- , 1974. "Le mythe prométhéen chez Hésiode", in: id., *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 178–194.
- , 1979. "À la table des hommes: Mythe de fondation du sacrifice chez Hésiode", in: M. Detienne–J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*, Paris, 37–132.
- , 1985. "Méthode structurale et mythe des races", in: J. Brunschwig–C. Imbert–A. Roger (eds.), *Histoire et Structure: À la mémoire de Victor Goldschmidt*, Paris, 43–60.
- , 1990. "Le mythe hésiodique des races: Essai d'analyse structurale", in: J.-P. Vernant–P. Vidal-Naquet (eds.), *La Grèce ancienne*, vol. I, Paris, 13–43 (= J.-P. Vernant (ed.), *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*, vol. I, Paris 1985, 19–45 = "Le mythe hésiodique des races: Essai d'analyse structurale", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 157, 1960, 21–54).
- , 1996. "Les semblances de Pandore", in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, Lille, 381–392.
- Versnel, H.S. 1987. "Greek Myth and Ritual: the Case of Kronos", in: J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London, 121–152.
- Vian, F. 1960. "Le mythe de Typhée et le problème de ses origines orientales", in: O. Eissfeldt (ed.), *Éléments orientaux dans le religion grecque ancienne*, Paris, 17–27.
- , 1976. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome I. Chants I–II*. Paris.
- Visentin, M. 1997. "Di Echidna e di altre femmine anguiformi", *Métis* 12, 205–221.
- Volk, K. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic*. Oxford.
- von Fritz, K. 1956. "Das Proömium der hesiodischen Theogonie", in: *Festschrift Br. Snell*, Munich, 29–45 (= Heitsch 1966, 295–315).
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. 1916a. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin.
- , 1916b. (ed.) *Vitae Homeri et Hesiodi*. Berlin (repr. 1929).
- , 1928a. "Lese Früchte", *Hermes* 63, 369.
- , 1928b. *Hesiods Erga*. Berlin.
- , 1931. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, vol. I. Berlin.
- Wackernagel, J. 1916. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen.
- Waern, I. 1951. *Γῆς ὀστέα: the Kenning in the Pre-Christian Greek Poetry*, Diss. Uppsala.
- Waeschke, H. 1874. *De Aristarchi studiis Hesiodiis*. Leipzig.
- Walcot, P. 1962a. "Hesiod and the Instructions of 'Onsheshonqy'", *JNES* 21, 215–219.
- , 1962b. "Hesiod and the Didactic Literature of the Near East", *RÉG* 75, 13–36.
- , 1966. *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff.
- Walsh, Th.R. 1995. "Odyssey 1.6–9: a little more than kine", *Mnemosyne* 48, 385–410.
- Wathelet, P. 1970. *Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*, (= *Incunabula Graeca* vol. 37), Rome.

- Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford.
- Wegner, I. 2000. *Hurritisch. Eine Einführung*. Wiesbaden.
- Wehrli, F. 1969. *Phainias von Eresos. Chamaileon. Praxiphanes*, Die Schule des Aristoteles vol. IX, Basel–Stuttgart.
- West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.
- , 1967a. “The contest of Homer and Hesiod”, *CQ* 17, 433–450.
- , 1967b. “Alcman and Pythagoras”, *CQ* 17, 1–15.
- , 1969. “Echoes and Imitations of the Hesiodic Poems”, *Philologus* 113, 1–9.
- , 1971. *Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford.
- , 1973. “Greek Poetry 2000–700 BC”, *CQ* 23, 179–192.
- , 1978. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.
- , 1982. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.
- , 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford.
- , 1986. “Further Echoes and Imitations of the Hesiodic Poems”, *Philologus* 130, 1–7.
- , 1988. “The Rise of the Greek Epic”, *JHS* 108, 151–172.
- , 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- , 1998–2000. *Homeri Ilias*, vol. I–II. Stuttgart–Leipzig.
- , 1999. “The Invention of Homer”, *CQ* 49, 364–382.
- , 2001a. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Munich–Leipzig.
- , 2001b. “Response by M.L.W. on Nagy and Nardelli”, *BMCR* 2001.09.06.
- , 2002. “Zenodotus’ Text”, in: F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del Congresso di Genova 6–8 luglio 2000*, Rome, 137–142.
- , 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge MA–London.
- , 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- , 2008. “The Hesiod Papyri and the Archaic Epic Language”, in: G. Bastianini–A. Casanova (eds.), *Esiado. Cent’anni di papiri, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi* (Florence, 7–8 June 2007), Florence, 29–42.
- West, S. 1994. “Prometheus Orientalized”, *MH* 51, 129–149.
- Wikander, S. 1952. “Histoire des Ouranides”, *Cahiers du Sud* 36, 91–95.
- Wilhelm, G. 1989. *The Hurrians*. Warminster.
- Winter, J.G. 1925. “A New Fragment on the Life of Homer”, *TAPA* 56, 120–129.
- Wismann, H. 1996. “Propositions pur une lecture d’Hésiode”, in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d’Hésiode*, Lille, 15–24.
- Wolbergs, T. 1988. “Hesiod”, *RAC* 14, 1191–1205.
- Wolkow, B.M. 2007. “The Mind of a Bitch: Pandora’s Motive and Intent in the *Erga*”, *Hermes* 137, 247–262.
- Wright, J.R.G. 1983. “Virgil’s Pastoral Programme. Theocritus, Callimachus and Eclogue I”, *PCPhS* 29, 107–160.
- Zannini Quirini, B. 1987. “Laldilà nella religione del mondo classico”, in: P. Xella (ed.), *Archeologia dell’inferno*, Verona, 263–307.
- Zeitlin, F.I. 1996a. “Signifying Difference: The Case of Hesiod’s Pandora”, in:

- F.I. Zeitlin (ed.), *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*, Chicago, 53–86.
- , 1996b. “Origine de la femme et la femme origine: la Pandore d’Hésiode”, in: F. Blaise–P. Judet de la Combe–Ph. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d’Hésiode*, Lille, 349–392.
- Zerdin, J. 2002. “The ‘iterative-intensives’ in—κον”, *Oxford Univ. Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics*, 7, 103–130.

GENERAL INDEX

- A.GILIM, 26 and n. 70
 abstractions, 232 n. 45
 Acarnania, 121
 Acastus, 168
 Accius, 344 and n. 6
 accusative, 73, 142 n. 42, 183–184,
 187–189, 191, 200–201
 Achelous, 217
 Achilles, 51, 66, 93, 100, 110, 125, 128,
 165–166, 176, 207, 214, 241, 289
 Acontius, 222, 240 n. 64, 242, 243
 and n. 74
 Actaeon, 115 n. 52, 244, 247
 Actor, 167
 Acusilaus of Argos, 100 and n. 25,
 329 and n. 49
 Adad, 12
 adamant, 48
 adjective(s), 139, 143, 338
Admonitions of Ipuwar, 15 and n. 27
 Adodos, 12
 Adrasteia, 130
 Adriatic (sea), 244
 Aegean (sea), 19, 20, 235
 Aegimius, 124–125
 Aegle, 98, 124
 Aelian
 Historical miscellany, 105, 336
 and n. 78
 Aeolic dialect, 181, 184–187, 190,
 193, 197, 199, 201, 289–291; East
 or Asiatic Aeolic, 181–182, 184
 n. 7, 185, 187
 Aeolids, 212, 213, 241
 Aeolis, Eastern, 117, 200, 290
 Aeolism, 157, 183, 186, 199
 Aeolus, 112–113, 115, 125, 159, 215
 Aeschines, 101
 Aeschylus, 21, 30, 257, 264 and
 n. 32, 265
 Prometheus Bound, 30 n. 84, 77
 n. 23
 Aesopic tradition, 18, 231 and
 nn. 39–40, 353
 Aetna, 30, 237
Aetna, 351 n. 28
 Agamemnon, 76 n. 18, 166, 204,
 214, 217
 Agdistis, 32
 Agenor, 113
 ages, myth of, *see* races, myth of
 Agias of Troezen, 97, 125
 agriculture, 10, 14, 19, 21, 76, 78–
 80, 84, 87, 96, 129, 248–252,
 264, 266, 344 n. 7, 355–357, 369;
 agriculture section in *Works and*
 Days, 138, 142, 147–150, 176
 Agrius, 215
aidos, 250 n. 94, 251; personified, 81,
 359
 Aietes, 125
 Aigipan, 30
ainos, 205, 230–232, 353
 Aither, 55 and n. 50
 Aithon, 216, 249 n. 91
 aitiology, 219, 221, 226 nn. 23–24,
 239 and n. 63, 241, 244, 291 and
 n. 50, 301, 303, 352, 362
 Ajax son of Oileus, 263
 Ajax son of Telamon, 166, 263, 265–
 266
 Akkadian, 22 n. 55, 27 n. 74
 Al Mina, 32, 35
 Alalu, 10, 29
 Alcaeus, 182, 230, 282 n. 30
 Alcidas, 91, 264, 299, 305, 306,
 314–315, 323, 344 n. 4
 Alcinous, 166, 172 n. 185, 249 n. 92,
 277
 Alcmaeonidae, 302
Alcmaeonis, 121
 Alcman, 171 n. 182, 200 and n. 40,
 201 and n. 41
 Alcmaon, 121–122

- Alcmene, 109–110, 112–114,
139, 166, 171 n. 181, 215, 217,
336
- Alcyone, 125, 167, 215, 244
- Alexander Aetolus, 219, 220 n. 2
- Alexander the Great, 257 n. 13, 267
n. 36, 348
- Alexandria, 3, 101–103, 105–106,
108, 119, 219, 222, 228, 229
- allegorical interpretation, 266, 313,
325–327, 353 n. 30
- allegory, 69, 71–72, 83, 228, 230,
234, 266, 362
- alliteration, 162
- Aloads, 244
- Amos, 18 and n. 43, 19
- Amphidamas, 45 n. 21, 55, 86, 92,
137, 156, 183, 193, 292, 298–299,
314–315
- Amphilocus, 122
- Amphytrion, 109, 217
- Anacreon, 254
- analepsis, 135, 216
- analyst criticism, 65 n. 82
- anaphora, 137, 267–268; inverse, 268
n. 38
- Anatolia, Anatolian cultures, 10, 11,
19, 30–34, 65
- Androgeus, 242
- Andromache, 26
- Andronicus (addressee of Calli-
machus' *Iambus* 2), 230
- animals, 17, 25, 60, 133, 196, 231–
232
- Anthologia Palatina* (anon.), 222,
226
- Antidorus of Cyme, 101, 294 n. 58,
314 and n. 5
- Antilochus, 214
- Antimachus
Lyde, 241 n. 65
- Antinous, 173 n. 187
- Antiochus (ancestor of the Anti-
ochid tribe), 199
- Antiope, 112
- antistrophe, 268
- antithesis, 268
- Antoninus Liberalis, 119
- Anu, 10–11, 13, 21–22, 28–30, 34
- aoidos* *see* singer
- aorist, 52, 134–135, 198
- apate*, 69; personified, 56
- Aphrodite, 12, 39, 40 n. 9, 46 and
n. 26, 49 and n. 34, 50, 181, 204,
207; *see also* Venus
- Apollo, 53 n. 45, 75, 92 n. 2, 110–
111, 122, 126, 168, 181, 182 n. 2,
214, 216, 224, 225 and n. 19, 235
and n. 52, 245, 284–285, 300–302,
320, 340, 370–371
- Apollodorus (the mythographer)
Library, 30–31, 45, 112, 115 and
n. 53, 124–125, 158, 242 n. 69,
364, 365 n. 70
- Apollodorus of Athens, 120, 199
On the Gods, 365 n. 70
- Apollonius Rhodius, 102–104, 105
n. 33, 106, 130, 219, 220 n. 2, 222
n. 9, 237 n. 55, 238 n. 61, 264
n. 31, 323–324, 335 and n. 70,
337 n. 80, 338, 341
- Apsu, 13
- Arachne, 364–365
- Aratus, 5, 78, 129, 219 and n. 1, 220
and n. 2, 221, 228 and n. 31, 257–
259, 261, 333, 358–359
- Arcadia, 60 n. 65, 233–234, 359
- Arcadian dialect, 188
- Arcadians, 113, 185, 212, 242
- Arcado-Cyprian dialect, 190, 195
- archaism, 254; false, 116; in Hesiod's
language, 187, 190, 197
- Archestratus of Gela, 156–157, 345
- Archias, 107, 240
- Archilochus, 307, 308 and n. 100,
313, 316
fr., 46 n. 26, 150 n. 72
- Arctinus of Miletus, 97, 127, 237
n. 56, 303
- Ares, 110, 207, 213, 237, 263–264
- Argo, 125
- Argonauts, 119, 125, 217, 220 n. 2,
226, 242, 244
- Argos, 122, 171 n. 181, 248

- Ariadne, 98, 124
 Aristarchus of Samothrace, 96, 102,
 105 and n. 33, 260, 316–321, 324
 and n. 39, 333, 337–341, 354
 Aristarchus (tragedian), 257
 Aristides
 On rhetoric, 37
 Aristonicus, 6, 184 n. 10, 332 n. 55,
 338 n. 89, 339 and n. 94, 354
 Aristophanes (comic poet)
 Banqueters, 100, 313 n. 2
 Frogs, 100, 257–258, 261, 264 and
 n. 32, 265, 347
 Peace, 101
 Aristophanes of Byzantium, 102,
 104, 108, 128, 222 n. 9, 260, 321
 n. 31, 323, 324 and n. 39, 333,
 335–338, 341, 354 and n. 31
 Aristotle, 6, 101, 119, 203, 313, 315–
 316, 328, 330–333, 342, 346
 Constitution of Orchomenus, 99
 n. 19, 101, 305
 Hesiodic Problems, 101, 222 n. 9,
 316
 Metaphysics, 329
 Physics, 330 n. 50
 Poetics, 95, 96 n. 11, 108, 170 and
 nn, 176 and 178, 203 n. 2, 322
 Vita Hesychii, 316 n. 12
 fr., 123–124, 292
 Aristoxenus, 320–321
 Arkas, 113
 Artemis, 164 n. 132, 242, 244, 247
 Artemon, 102
 articles, 188, 201 n. 40
 Asclepiades (epigrammatist), 107,
 257 n. 13
 Asclepiades of Myrleia, 102, 129
 Asclepius, 105, 120, 196
 Ascra, 5, 86, 131, 154, 156, 181, 220,
 229, 249 n. 93, 271, 291, 294, 310,
 343, 347 n. 18, 349–350
 Asia, 9, 32, 56 n. 52
 — Minor, 122, 131, 182, 237, 271,
 289–294, 298
 Asius of Samos, 111–112
 Asopids, 213, 215 n. 45, 242
 Asopus, 113
 assonance, 49, 137, 162–163, 268
 Astarte, 12, 24 n. 61, 49 n. 34
 Asteria, 235 n. 52, 236
asteriskos (critical sign), 339
 Atalante, 113–115, 164 n. 133, 215,
 216 n. 46, 243, 362
 Athena, 25 and n. 66, 49 n. 34, 50,
 53 n. 45, 66, 69, 98, 110, 167, 216,
 245–248, 263–264, 361
 Athenaeus, 94, 97, 119–121, 123–
 125, 129, 323 and n. 35, 324, 345
 n. 11
 Athens, 5, 58, 97–102, 111, 117, 194
 n. 28, 199, 292–297, 301, 303,
 311
 athetesis, 102–103, 315, 317 n. 19,
 318 and n. 21, 319, 331 and n. 53,
 335, 337 and n. 84, 338, 340–341
 Atlantids, 213 and n. 40, 242
 Atlas, 12, 112, 113, 263, 266
 Atrahasis, 16
Atrahasis Epic, 10 n. 5, 15–16
 Attic dialect, 182, 188, 190, 196,
 199–200
 Attica, 99, 161, 182, 189, 192–193,
 296, 333 n. 62
 Atticism, 183
 audience, 2–3, 40 n. 10, 42–44, 55,
 73, 76, 91, 96, 117, 128, 131–132,
 134–135, 138–141, 144–145, 148,
 156–160, 170–172, 175, 183, 193,
 199, 256, 264, 276–277, 310
 Augustus, 359–360, 362, 368, 372,
 373 and n. 83, 374 n. 84
 Aulis, 86, 122, 151, 176, 214, 292,
 294, 298 n. 71, 310
 authenticity of Hesiod's works, 3,
 6, 64, 68, 89, 101–104, 106, 108,
 116, 118, 125, 128, 180, 195, 197,
 207 n. 16, 222 n. 9, 315, 317–
 318, 321–325, 330, 333–338,
 342
 autobiography, *see* voice, autobio-
 graphical
 automatization, process of, 174, 177
 Avienus, 359

- Baal, 12, 13 n. 20, 24, 32 n. 92
Baal Cycle, 12
 Babylon, 24
 Babylonian culture, 10 n. 5, 13, 15,
 21, 22 n. 55, 24, 29, 42, 49 n. 34
 Bacchus, 361 and n. 54, 373
 Bacchylides
 Epinicia, 45, 100 and n. 21, 127,
 155, 181, 334
 Paeans, 125
 Baitylos, 12
 Batrachus, 93–95
Battle of Cranes (Geranomachia), 92
 — of *Frogs and Mice (Batrachomy-*
 omachia), 92
 — of *Spiders (Arachnomachia)*, 92
 — of *Starlings (Psaromachia)*, 92–
 93
 Bellerophon, 58
 Belus, 113
 Bias, 121
 Bible
 Amos, 18, 19
 Apocrypha of, 16, 20 n. 47
 Genesis, 16 and n. 31
 Jubilees, 16 n. 31
 biography, biographical tradition,
 5–6, 95, 101, 131, 168, 216–217,
 224 n. 14, 271–311, 314–315, 316
 n. 13
 birth of gods and other entities,
 10–12, 22–23, 25 and n. 66, 26,
 28, 38, 42, 44, 46, 49 and n. 34,
 50, 53, 58, 66 n. 85, 70, 89, 97,
 103, 109–110, 113–114, 120, 122,
 160, 167, 177, 204, 206, 209, 213,
 216, 226, 232–235, 245, 317, 361
 n. 54, 372 n. 81; of Hesiod, 133,
 278, 294; of Homer, 291, 294; of
 Pindar, 194
 birth through the head, 25 and n. 66
 Blessed, Isles of the, 15, 16, 80 and
 n. 34
 blood, 12, 49, 88, 210, 245–246
 Boethus of Sidon, 259–260
 Boeotia, 92–93, 138, 175, 180, 182–
 183, 192–194, 200, 222, 271, 277–
 278, 289, 292, 296, 298 n. 71, 302
 and n. 83, 305–307, 309–310, 359
 Boeotian dialect, 181–182, 187, 190,
 191 and n. 22, 193–195, 198, 333,
 n. 62
 Boeotian poetic tradition, 181–182
 Boeotian tradition of Hesiod's
 poems, 93, 105, 317, 324 n. 39,
 336
 Boeotisms, 193–195, 333 n. 62
 Boio, 186 and n. 13
Book of Ahikar, 17 and n. 36, 18
 Boreads, 218, 243–244
 Boreas, 114, 140
 Briareos, 237 and n. 57
 Briseis, 164 n. 132
 Bronze Age, 19, 27, 31–35
 Bronze race, 49, 78–80, 81 n. 37,
 146–147, 235 n. 51

 Cadmus, 30–31, 167
 Calchas, 122
 calendar, 71, 84 n. 43, 85–88, 358
 Callimachus, 4, 6, 219–252, 258–
 259, 333, 345, 350, 366
 Aitia, 103, 107 n. 39, 150 n. 72,
 220–229, 238–244, 345, 360,
 372 n. 81
 Bath of Pallas, 226 n. 22, 245–248
 Epigrams, 5, 95, 129, 220, 223
 n. 12, 228, 257, 258 and n. 14,
 261 and n. 23, 262, 346, 358
 and n. 45
 Hymn to Apollo, 226 n. 22
 — to *Delos*, 233, 235–238, 244–
 245
 — to *Demeter*, 226 n. 22, 238,
 245, 248–252
 — to *Zeus*, 233 and n. 47, 234,
 369
 Iambi, 223 n. 13, 228–232
 Pinakes, 336
 Calliope, 226, 372
 Callirhoe, 209
 Callisto, 212
 Calypso, 70, 249 n. 92
 cannibalism, 34

- capture of Oechalia, 217, 373
Carmen Naupactium *see* *Naupactia*
 Carneades, 328
 Cassandra, 164 n. 132
 Cassius Emina, 344
 catalogue poetry, 41, 49, 54, 57, 68,
 85, 89, 96, 109, 111–113, 116–
 117, 122, 135, 138–139, 147, 157,
 161–162, 163 and n. 125, 165–
 175, 177, 203–210, 213, 215, 217–
 218, 221, 227, 234, 236, 238 and
 n. 61, 240–243, 260, 351, 362, 365
 Catullus, 358–359
 Cecrops, 58
 Centaur, 176
 Cephalenia, 218
 Cerberus, 57–58, 65, 351
Cercopes, 93
 Cercops of Miletus, 97, 123–125
 Ceres, 357, 361
Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi, 5, 91,
 92 and n. 3, 93 n. 4, 101, 123, 182,
 258, 261, 262 n. 26, 263 n. 27, 264
 nn. 31–32, 290 n. 48, 297–300,
 303–306, 310, 314–315, 344 and
 n. 4, 347 n. 18, 365, 369
 Ceto, 57, 140, 208–209
 Ceus, 243
 Ceyx, 125, 167, 215, 244
 Chalcas, 176
 Chalcis in Euboea, 3, 86, 88, 90, 92
 and n. 3, 137, 151, 153–156, 176,
 193, 271, 292, 298 and n. 71, 299,
 303–304, 310, 314–315
 Chamaeleon, 101, 316 and nn. 13
 and 15
 Chaos, 37, 45 and n. 20, 55–56, 58,
 105, 208, 223, 227, 326 and n. 46,
 328–329, 331 n. 53, 334, 360–363,
 370–373
 Chariclo, 246–247
 Charitades' son (addressee of
 Callimachus' Iambus 4), 230
 Charites, 226, 239
 Chasm, *see* Chaos
 Chersias of Orchomenus, 112, 126
 n. 68
chi (critical sign), 339
 chiasmus, 49, 55 n. 51, 267 n. 37,
 268
 Chimaera, 57, 351, 357
 Chios, 97, 286, 290, 307
 Chiron, 100, 128–129
 Chloris, 112, 171 n. 181
 Choerilus, 316
 Choeroboscus, 184 n. 10
 Chrysaor, 57, 209
 Chrysippus, 25 n. 66, 100 n. 26, 328,
 340, 342
 Chrysothemis, 186
 Church Fathers, 365
 cicada, 150
 Cicero, 255, 358
 Brutus, 254 n. 5
 Cato, 344
 De natura deorum, 123–124, 326,
 343
 De officiis, 356
 Epistulae ad Atticum, 102, 354
 n. 31, 356 n. 30
 Epistulae ad Familiares, 355
 Orator, 254 n. 5
 Pro Cluentio, 356
 Tusculanae disputationes, 343
 Cilicia, 30, 31 n. 85, 32–33, 122
 Cinaethon of Sparta, 112
 Circe, 70, 218
 citations from poems in philosophi-
 cal discourse, 325–332
 Clarus, 122
 Clement of Alexandria
 Stromateis, 124, 303
 Clidanope, 162
 Clinias Carystius, 123 and n. 64
 Clio, 226, 239, 349–350
 Clymene, 363
 Clytaemestra, 115, 166, 214
 Coeus, 208, 236
 Colchians, 244
 Colophon, 122, 298
 Columella
 De re rustica, 355
 Comanus of Naucratis, 338 and n. 88
 comedy, 100–101, 182, 191

- “commentary” by narrative voice,
 132, 138–141
 compound words, 5, 194 and n. 26,
 195, 197, 266, 274–275, 287–289
 contraction, 193, 195, 198
 copies of Hesiod’s poems in
 antiquity, 103–104, 112, 125, 127,
 316–320, 330
 Cornelius Gallus, 345, 362–363, 366
 Coronis, 168, 196, 239
 Corsica, 236
 Corycus, 30–34
 Cos, 217
 cosmogony, 28 n. 76, 30, 32 n. 92,
 34, 105, 114, 160, 232–233, 238,
 326–328, 334, 345, 362, 373
 cosmology, 64, 330; Stoic, 326–328,
 340, 360
 Cottus, 211, 216
Counsels of Wisdom, 17 and n. 36
 Crates of Mallos, 102–103, 105 n. 33,
 318–322, 324, 333 n. 61, 335,
 340–341
 Creophylidai, 97
 Creophylus of Samos, 97
 Capture of Oechalia, 92, 97
 Crete, 33, 50–51, 60 n. 65, 167, 197
 n. 34, 210, 218, 233–234
 “crime and punishment” motif, 244–
 252
 critical signs in manuscripts, 337–
 339, 354
 Cronids, 211
 Cronus, 10 and n. 9, 11 and n. 9, 12,
 23, 24 and n. 59, 25, 28, 30, 31
 n. 85, 32 n. 92, 34, 39, 43–44, 46,
 48–55, 59–60, 79, 208, 210, 216,
 231 and n. 41, 233–234, 247 and
 n. 88; *see also* Saturn
 cult hero, Hesiod as, 304–308
 Cyclades, 242
 Cyclopes, 48–49, 51 n. 36, 57, 59, 63,
 65, 139, 326, 340
 Cycnus, 98–99, 110–111, 196
 Cydippe, 222, 240 n. 64, 241–242,
 243 and n. 74
 Cyme, 131, 156, 182, 290–292, 294
 Cynaethus of Chios, 97
 Cyprias of Halicarnassus, 97
 Cyprus, 236
 Cyrenaean dialect, 188
 Cyrene, 100, 117 n. 56, 121, 164
 n. 133
 Cynus, 156, 230
 Dagon, 12
daimones (Zeus’ guardians), 79 and
 n. 31, 82
Danais, 127 n. 70
 dancing, 37 and n. 2, 38, 278, 282,
 288, 301 n. 79
 dative, 183, 194
 Day, *see* Hemere
 Death, *see* Ker and Thanatos
 Deianeira, 217
 deletion of verses (*diagraphein*), 318
 and n. 21
 Delia (festival), 301–302, 303
 Delian Maidens, 284–287, 301–302
 Delphi, 11, 33, 110–111, 182, 185–
 186, 200, 300–302
 Delphic Amphictyony, 117, 161
 n. 119
 — dialect, 182, 185–186
 — oracle, 184–185
 Delphyne, 30
 Delus, 5, 92 and n. 2, 235 and n. 52,
 236 and n. 54, 242, 244, 284, 286,
 287 and n. 38, 300–303, 307, 310,
 314
 Demarous, 12
 Demeter, 85, 248–252
 Demetrius, 5
 On style, 265–266, 267 and n. 37
 Demetrius Ixion, 341
 Democritus, 359
 Demodice, 167
 Demodochus, 207
 Demosthenes, 101
 Deucalion, 113, 159, 213, 241
 Deucalionids, 161, 214
 dialect(s), 4, 157, 179–201, 289–291
Dichterweihe *see* initiation into
 poetry

- “didactic drama”, 228–230
 Didymus, 6, 339
Diegeiseis of Callimachus’ works, 230
 n. 38, 231
 digamma, 183, 191 n. 22, 192
dike *see* justice
 Dike, 2, 69, 78, 82 and n. 40, 89, 220,
 230, 232 n. 45, 357, 359
 Dio of Prusa, 240, 264 n. 31, 267
 n. 36, 348, 364 and n. 65
 Diogenes Laertius, 123, 316, 328,
 331–332, 334
 Diogenes of Babylon, 334
 Diogenes of Sinope, 101
 Dionysius Chalkous, 156
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 5
 De compositione verborum, 254,
 256, 266
 De imitatione (Epitome), 254–255
 Demosthenes, 254–255, 256, 267–
 268
 Dionysius Thrax, 341
 Dionysus, 24 n. 58, 239, 251, 265,
 361 n. 54
diple (critical sign), 339
 Dirce, 236 n. 53
 Dorians, 124
 Doric dialect, 182, 184–190, 193,
 195, 197, 199–201
 Doris, 124, 185
 Doros, 124, 159
 Dotion in Thessaly, 249
 dream, 220, 222, 224 and n. 15, 241,
 345; personified, *see* Oneiroi
 Dryopes, 125
 dual, 186 n. 14
 Dymas, 124

 Ea, 13, 21, 23, 25
Ea and the Beast, 25
 Earth, *see* Gaia
 Ebla, 11
 Echidna, 57, 58 and n. 61
 editions of Hesiod in antiquity,
 101–102, 333–334, 338, 341,
 354
 Egypt, 9, 17, 20, 95, 107, 112

 Egyptian culture, 9, 13 n. 20, 15–
 17, 18 n. 41, 20, 22, 24 n. 61, 232
 n. 46
 Eirene, 69
 El, 12, 32 n. 92
 Elioun, 12
Eloquent Peasant, 17 and n. 35, 18
 Elpis, 76–78, 338
 Empedocles, 156
 Endymion, 120, 168
enjambement, 61
 Enki, 10 n. 5, 15
Enki and World Order, 10 n. 5
 Enlil, 13, 15
 Ennius, 220, 344–346
Enuma Elish, 13 and n. 16, 24, 29
 Epaphroditus, 104, 325, 341, 354
 Ephesos, 31
 Ephorus of Cyme, 94, 290
 Epic Cycle, 92, 95, 127, 166 n. 142,
 167–168, 170, 294, 303; *see also*
 under poets’ names
Aethiopsis, 92, 96, 106 and n. 35,
 127, 166 n. 142
Cypria, 25 n. 67, 92, 96–97, 113
 and n. 50, 115, 127 n. 70, 342
Epigoni, 92, 96, 122
Little Iliad, 92, 97, 127 n. 71, 166
 n. 142, 303
Oedipodia, 96
Returns, 92, 96, 122, 125, 127
 n. 70, 166, 173
Thebaid, 92, 96
Epic of Baal and Yamm, 24
 — *of Gilgamesh*, 15, 34
 — *of Liberation*, 17, 25
 Epicharmus, 188, 191, 197 n. 35,
 200–201 and nn. 40–41
 Epicurus, 328, 359, 365–366
 Epigeios, 12
 epigram(s), 93, 179, 181, 182 and
 n. 2, 200 and n. 40, 230, 257–258,
 273 n. 12, 293, 300 nn. 77–78,
 304–305, 306 n. 93
Epikichlides, 93–94
 Epimenides, 224 n. 15
 Epimetheus, 77

- Epithalamia*, 93, 94 n. 7
 epithet, 37, 40 and n. 8, 44 n. 19, 45
 and n. 22, 49 and n. 34, 54, 55
 nn. 50–51, 58, 60–61, 63 nn. 73–
 74, 77, 140, 164, 195 and n. 30,
 196, 255 n. 10, 258, 268, 288, 297,
 308 n. 100
 eponyms, 18, 107, 114, 124, 239, 242
 Eratosthenes, 219, 305
 Erebos, 45, 55 and n. 50, 206
 Erinyes, 49, 65, 210, 245, 351
 Eris, Erides, 55, 56, 72, 74 and n. 12,
 81, 89, 230 and n. 38, 250 and
 n. 95, 316
 Eros, 30, 46 and n. 26, 55 n. 50, 206,
 328–329, 331 n. 53
 Erysichthon, 238, 245 n. 80, 248
 n. 89, 249–252
 etymological interpretation, ancient,
 40 and n. 8, 49–50, 138, 212, 287–
 288, 326–328, 344 n. 7
Etymologicum Genuinum AB, 341
 — *Gudianum*, 338
 — *Magnum*, 338, 341
 — of Orion, 339
 Euanthe, 239
 Euboea, 86, 92, 180–183, 193, 236,
 292, 298 and n. 71, 306, 310, 314
 Euchenor, 214
 Eudoxus, 129
 Eumelus, 237 n. 56
 Europia, 127 n. 70
 Euphorion, 219, 362
 Euphronios (vase-painter), 100
 Euripides, 254, 264 n. 32, 316
 Bacchae, 245 n. 80
 Cyclops, 190
 Hippolytus, 56 n. 54
 Ion, 245 n. 82
 Euripus, 182
 Europa, 167
 Eurynome, 69 n. 90, 216, 239
 Eurythemiste, 168
 Eurytos, 214
 Eusebius
 Praeparatio Evangelica, 194 n. 29
 Eustathius, 240, 290 n. 48
 Euthydemus, 230
 Eve, 16
Excerptum de vetere Iliade, 320
 exegesis on Hesiod, ancient, 6, 313–
 342
 fable, 17 and n. 38, 71–72, 82–83,
 205, 228–231, 351 n. 28, 353; *aeē*
 also ainos
 farming, 5, 19, 43 n. 15, 84–86, 96–
 97, 148–150, 249 n. 93, 250–251,
 310, 348, 357–358
 Feridun, 14 n. 21
 Festus, Paulus, 344 n. 7
 fire, theft of by Prometheus, 14, 61,
 76, 357
 formulae, formulaic diction, 26, 40
 and n. 8, 49 nn. 33–34, 60–61, 66,
 106, 109, 111 and n. 46, 114, 116,
 118–119, 154, 160–162, 164–165,
 169–170, 174, 176–177, 180, 187–
 190, 198–199, 212, 213 and nn. 38–
 39, 239, 240 n. 64, 243, 330
Funeral Games for Pelias, 92
 Gaia, 2, 11, 23, 25, 28, 37, 39, 41, 45–
 51, 56–58, 60 n. 67, 62, 63 n. 73,
 65–70, 77, 136, 206, 208, 210,
 216, 233–235, 326 n. 46, 328–329,
 340, 361, 371
 Galen
 Protrepticus, 308 n. 100
 Gauls, 238
 gelding, 10–12, 28, 30, 46, 48–50, 56
 n. 54, 210, 246
 Gellius, Aulus
 Attic nights, 300 n. 77, 344 and n. 9
 gender, 28 n. 76, 56, 136–137, 171
 genealogy, genealogical literature, 4,
 41, 43 n. 14, 44, 63–64, 79, 95–96,
 100 and n. 25, 105–107, 111–119,
 122, 135, 137, 140, 144, 147, 158,
 160–162, 166 n. 143, 169 and
 n. 174, 170, 172–177, 199, 203–
 204, 206 n. 11, 207–210, 212–218,
 219, 221, 232, 236, 238–240, 242
 and nn. 69 and 72, 328, 361–364

- genitive $\alpha\omicron$, 183, 195–196
 genre, 6, 53, 71–72, 82, 91, 95–96,
 98, 108, 123, 131, 132 n. 6, 161–
 163, 166–167, 171–175, 205 n. 8,
 220, 228 n. 32, 235, 238, 252 n. 98
 geography, 4, 160–162, 169–171,
 176, 213, 218, 224 n. 17, 232, 234,
 237 n. 55, 242–243
 Geras, 56
 Geryoneus, 57, 208–209
 Giants, 49, 57, 206 and n. 14, 245
 and n. 82, 246, 351, 357 and n. 42,
 371–373
 Gigantomachy, 206 n. 14, 245, 370,
 372, 373 and n. 83
gnomai, 72, 84, 88, 128, 253
 gnomic discourse or poetry, 128,
 222, 228, 261
Gnomologium Vaticanum Graecum,
 99
 gods, 2–3, 6, 10–16, 19–23, 26, 28,
 30, 34, 38–41, 44–45, 51–54, 56–
 66, 69–70, 72–73, 76–77, 79–81,
 83–84, 87–90, 98–100, 105, 109–
 110, 113, 123, 128, 133, 138–140,
 142, 144, 147, 152, 158 n. 103,
 159, 165, 167–168, 203–208, 210–
 214, 224 n. 15, 225 n. 18, 226,
 231–233, 236 n. 53, 237 n. 56,
 238–241, 243–245, 247–249, 251,
 272, 278, 281–282, 284, 295–297,
 317, 320, 326, 328–329, 340, 345,
 348, 359–365, 371–373
 Golden Age, 14–15, 23, 24 and n. 59,
 61, 78, 80, 86, 247–249, 351 n. 28,
 357 n. 42, 359, 362, 366–368, 374
 Gorgons, 57, 351
 Gortyn, 197 n. 34
 Graces, 68
 Graeae, 57
 Grinium, 362

 Habron, 341–342
 Hades, 46 n. 25, 52, 65, 80, 93, 126
 Harpies, 114, 218, 243, 351
 Harmonia, 167
 harvest, 85, 87, 148–149, 266, 357

 Hattusa, 10, 13, 17
 hawk, 82, 145, 205, 230, 353
 Hebat, 26
 Hecataeus of Abdera, 101, 314
 Hecataeus of Miletus, 100 and n. 24
 Hecate, 40 n. 9, 41, 52–55, 69 n. 92,
 132, 135–138, 175, 204, 208–210
 Hector, 106, 263, 265
 Hedammu, 10–11, 23, 30
 Hegesinus of Salamis, 97, 112
 Helen of Troy, 56 n. 52, 113–116,
 128, 151, 164 n. 133, 169, 170
 n. 177, 172–174, 213–215, 218,
 316
 Helice, 236 n. 53
 Helicon, Heliconian (Muses), *see*
 Mount Helicon
 Helios, 326
 Hellen, 113–114, 159, 241
 Hellespont, 289–290
 Hemere, 55 and n. 50
 Hephaestus, 61, 66, 67 and n. 86, 70,
 104, 207, 323–324
Heptapaktike, 93
 Hera, 25 n. 67, 58, 66, 70, 104, 139,
 167, 237, 239, 240 n. 64, 244–245,
 324; *see also* Juno
 Heracleia/Iolaeia games, 111
 Heracleidai, 124
 Heracles, 12, 58, 62, 97–99, 104,
 108–111, 113–115, 119, 124–127,
 139–140, 159–160, 166–167, 196,
 204, 208–209, 214, 216, 217 and
 n. 48, 245, 323–324, 336, 373
 Heraclides of Miletus, 184 n. 10
 Heraclides Ponticus, 101, 316 and
 nn. 13–14
 Heraclitus
 Homeric problems, 266
 Heraclitus of Ephesus, 99 and n. 20,
 353
 herding, 5, 310, 348
 Hereas of Megara, 98
 Hermes, 21, 30, 54
 Hermesianax, 219, 353
 Hermogenes, 5, 255 n. 10, 268
 Hermus river, 291

- Hero, 365
 hero cults of poets, 304–307, 308
 and n. 87
 Herodotus, 100 and n. 26, 185 n. 12,
 296–297, 342, 373
 [Herodotus]
 Life of Homer, 93 n. 4, 94, 97 n. 5,
 156, 290 n. 48
 heroes, 16, 21, 58, 70, 78–81, 97–
 100, 105, 107–109, 113–115, 121,
 124–126, 128, 140, 145–147, 158–
 160, 168–169, 171, 175, 195, 204–
 205, 207–208, 211, 213–214, 226,
 239–242, 245, 250, 257, 296, 304–
 308, 312, 324, 345, 348, 363–364,
 369
 heroines, 112, 165, 166 and n. 143,
 168–169, 171, 173–174, 211, 219,
 240–241, 249
 Hesiod, language of, 179–201
 Aegimius, 94, 96–98, 110, 123–
 125
 Astronomy, 94, 109, 128–130, 176,
 361
 Catalogue of Women, 1, 3, 4, 68,
 93–94, 96 and n. 12, 97, 99–
 102, 104–120, 121 and n. 63,
 124–126, 128, 131, 157–177,
 179, 180 n. 1, 196 and n. 33,
 197–198, 212–218, 238–244,
 249 n. 91, 255, 294–296, 298,
 324, 335, 336 and n. 78, 337
 n. 80, 340–342, 348, 350, 361–
 365
 — proem of, 158 and n. 104, 171,
 248
 Circuit of the earth, 94
 Dirge (Epikedeion), 93–94
 Epithalamia, 94 n. 7
 Explanations of prodigies (?), 94
 Great Ehoiai, 93–94, 96, 99, 100
 n. 21, 107, 110–111, 118–121,
 124–125, 129, 172 n. 186, 238
 Great Works, 94, 109, 128–129
 Idaeon Dactyls, 93–94, 130, 176
 Katabasis of Theseus and Peirit-
 hous, 94, 95 n. 10, 126–128
 Mantica, 93–94
 Melampodia, 94, 96, 121–124,
 126, 176
 Ornithomanteia, 90 n. 57, 94, 103,
 106, 109, 129–130, 335
 Potters (Kaminos / Kerameis), 93–
 94, 176
 Precepts of Chiron, 93–94, 100
 and n. 22, 101, 109, 128–129,
 176, 180, 216 n. 46, 324 and
 n. 39, 325, 336
 Shield of Heracles (Ps. Hesiod's), 6,
 93–94, 98–99, 102, 104, 107–
 111, 114, 124–125, 165, 172,
 179, 181, 183, 193–194, 196,
 222 n. 9, 237 and n. 56, 262
 n. 25, 322–325, 335–338, 341–
 342, 344 n. 6, 353 n. 30, 354,
 362 n. 59
 Theogony, 1–6, 9–11, 13–14, 18,
 22, 25–27, 29, 32–33, 37–
 70, 90, 93–94, 96, 100 n. 26,
 103, 105 and n. 34, 106, 123,
 131–132 and n. 5, 132, 135–
 139, 140, 145 and n. 49, 153,
 158–159, 179–181, 183–185,
 186 and n. 14, 188, 190–193,
 195–196, 198–200, 205–212,
 221, 232–238, 245–248, 250
 n. 95, 255–256, 260–262,
 266, 271–272, 275–276, 280
 and n. 27, 282, 285, 287–
 288, 295, 308 and n. 100,
 325–330, 332–334, 338, 340–
 342, 345 and n. 12, 349–352,
 357, 361–363, 364 n. 64, 369,
 371
 —, proem of, 38, 41–44, 73 n. 9,
 75, 87, 102–103, 132–135, 144,
 148 and n. 64, 175, 205–208,
 211, 220, 222 and n. 9, 223–
 227, 230 n. 38, 246–247, 277–
 278, 317–322, 335, 337, 340,
 350
 Wedding of Ceyx, 94, 99, 100
 n. 21, 104, 110, 124–126, 336
 n. 76

- Works and Days*, 1–6, 14, 17–18, 21, 45 n. 21, 49, 71–90, 92 and nn. 2–3, 93–94, 96–97, 99, 113, 131, 137–138, 141–142, 147–157, 159, 176, 179–181, 183–184, 185 and n. 12, 186, 189–197, 199, 248–252, 255, 258 n. 14, 259, 262–263, 267–268, 271, 289, 291–292, 294, 299, 304, 314, 331 and n. 53, 336, 339, 341–342, 345, 347, 349–351, 353–357, 359, 361–363, 365 n. 71, 367–369
—, proem of, 73–74, 89–90, 102, 103 and n. 31, 106, 130, 222 n. 9, 316–322, 337, 340, 349, 350
frr., 25 n. 66, 92 and n. 2, 98, 100, 137, 142–143, 183–184, 190 n. 20, 300–301, 315 n. 10, 323;
dub., 314
Hesperides, 55, 57
Hesychius of Miletus, 93, 94 n. 7
Hieron, 30, 258
Hipparchus, 296
Hippocrene, 224 n. 17, 246
Hippodameia, 121
Hipponax, 222, 226 n. 22, 228, 229 and n. 33
Hippinous, 168
Hippostratus (hero), 168
Hippostratus (historian), 97
Hittite culture, 2, 10–13, 17, 22 n. 55, 24 and n. 62, 25–26, 28, 31–32, 34, 42, 65 n. 84
Homer, Homeric poetry, 3–6, 22 n. 55, 38–41, 44 n. 19, 45 n. 22, 53 n. 45, 63 and nn. 73–74, 64, 69 and n. 91, 71, 86 n. 47, 91, 92 and nn. 2–3, 97, 100 n. 26, 101, 108, 117–118, 179, 189, 211–212, 214–215, 220 and n. 2, 226, 240–241, 254, 257–259, 261–262, 266, 267 and n. 36, 269, 273–275, 279–280, 286–288, 290, 294, 313–316, 319–324, 332 and n. 56, 333, 337 n. 80, 338, 339 and nn. 93–94, 342, 343–348, 350–353, 360, 363, 365 and n. 71, 366, 369
—, language of (in comparison with Hesiod's), 179–201
Iliad, 10 n. 5, 26, 43, 47, 48 n. 30, 49 and n. 33, 52, 54, 56, 61–63, 65 n. 84, 66, 76 n. 18, 92, 95–97, 103–104, 106, 110–111, 126, 132, 148 n. 65, 158 n. 104, 163, 164 n. 132, 165, 166 n. 142, 170, 174, 179, 188 and nn. 16–17, 194, 195 nn. 30–31, 218, 222 n. 9, 226 n. 22, 237 n. 56, 254–255, 262–266, 268, 281, 289–290, 338
—, proem of, 207 and n. 18, 319–322
Odyssey, 43, 48 n. 30, 52, 56, 66, 77 n. 24, 84 n. 42, 87, 92, 95–98, 112 and n. 47, 121, 127, 132–134, 139 n. 36, 145 and n. 48, 152–155, 158 n. 104, 163–166, 169 n. 173, 170, 172 n. 185, 173–174, 179, 180 and n. 1, 188–189, 191, 195 n. 31, 197, 207 n. 18, 217–218, 255, 276–277, 296, 315 n. 10, 365 n. 71
—, proem of, 207 and n. 18, 319–322
Homeric Hymns, 38, 42, 92, 95, 103, 148, 164, 179, 189, 278, 281, 317
Hymn, 2 to Demeter 132, 181
—, 3 to Apollo 33, 148 n. 65, 181, 283–286, 287 and n. 38, 290, 301–302, 320
—, 4 to Hermes 132, 181, 197
—, 5 to Aphrodite 132, 181
—, 11 to Athena 132
—, 13 to Demeter 132
—, 16 to Asclepius 132
—, 22 to Poseidon 132
—, 25 to the Muses and Apollo 132 and n. 5, 181, 283–286, 287 and n. 38, 290, 301–302, 320
—, 26 to Dionysus 132
—, 28 to Athena 132
—, 32 to Selene 199

- Homeridai, 97, 307
 honey, 254–255, 367–368
Honor, 370–371
 Hope, *see* Elpis
 Horace
 Ars poetica, 169 n. 170
 Odes, 371, 372 n. 81
 Sermones, 344
 Horus, 13 n. 20
 Hundred-Handers, 48–49, 57, 59,
 63–65, 211, 216, 351
 hunger, 86, 250–251, 353 n. 30
 Hupasiya, 31
 Hurrian culture, 10, 12, 17, 24–29,
 32–34
 Hyades, 129
hybris, 78, 244, 245 n. 80, 248, 249
 n. 93, 251; personified, 82
 Hydra, 57–58, 208, 245
 Hylas, 362
 Hyllus, 124
 Hyperboreans, 100, 244
 hyperionic, 198
 Hypnos, 55, 64, 353 n. 30
hypothesis to Ps. Hesiod's *Shield*, 99,
 104 n. 32, 109, 323–324

 Iapetus, 51, 59, 159
 Ibycus, 201 n. 41
 Ileus, 244
 Illuyankas, 11, 31–34
 imperfect, 198
 Inachids, 212, 213 n. 40, 241
 Inachus, 112–113
 Inara, 31
 India, 9, 20–21
 Indian culture, 15, 20–21
 indicative, 142
 infinitive, 134, 183, 194
 injustice, 17, 53, 58, 69 n. 92, 81–82,
 147, 229, 237, 244–245, 248, 251,
 271, 357
 initiation into poetry, 6, 133–134,
 175, 211, 220 and n. 2, 275, 278,
 280–281, 283–284, 345, 350, 366
 inscriptions, 179, 185, 192–193, 194
 n. 27, 198, 296, 307–308

Instructions of Amenemope, 17 and
 n. 35, 18
 — of *Ipuwar*, 17 and n. 35
 — of *ʿOnkhsheshonqy*, 17 and n. 35,
 18, 20 n. 47
 interpolation, 65 n. 82, 102, 104–
 105, 116, 119, 147, 161, 179, 180
 n. 1, 223, 315, 330
 Io, 212, 215
 Iolaus, 104, 110, 323
 Iolcus, 216
 Ionia, 192, 290, 292, 307
 Ionian migration, 292–293
 Ios, 292
 Iphicles, 109–110
 Iphiclus, 121, 167, 241 n. 66
 Iphimede, 214
 Iphimedeia, 112
 Iran, 9, 20
 Iranian culture, 14–15, 27
 Iris, 237
 iron, 16, 66–67, 263–264
 Iron Age, 32–33
 Ischys, 168
 Ishtar, 23, 26 n. 70, 49 n. 34
 Ismenus river, 236 n. 53
 Isocrates
 ad Nicoclem, 353
 Panathenaicus, 313
Iulia, gens, 362

 Jamshid, 14 n. 21
 Janus, 360
 jar of ills, 72, 76–78, 250
 Jason, 128, 264 n. 31
 Joseph Flavius
 Against Apion, 100 and n. 25
 Jewish Antiquity, 16 n. 31
 Juno, 167, 326
 Jupiter, 326, 359, 371, 372 and n. 80
 justice, 17 and n. 38, 19–20, 41, 44,
 51–52, 53 and n. 45, 68, 69 n. 92,
 71–74, 75 and n. 17, 78–85, 87–
 89, 108, 143, 147, 205, 219, 244,
 247, 249 n. 93, 359, 368, 372;
 personified, *see* Dike
 Juvenal, 351, 359

- KA.ZAL, 26 and n. 70
 kenning, 54 n. 47, 157 n. 99, 184–185
 Ker, Keres, 55 and n. 51, 56
 kings, 29, 42, 44 and n. 19, 47, 51, 53
 n. 45, 72 and n. 7, 73–75, 79, 81–83, 228–230, 240–241, 249 n. 93, 255–256, 258, 309–310, 348, 365, 369, 372 and n. 81, 374
Kingship in Heaven Cycle, 2, 10–13, 21–22, 24–30, 33–35
 Kizzuwatna, 32
 Kratos (Strength), 244
 Kreios, 338
 Kteatos, 214
 Kubaba, 23
 Kumarbi, 10, 11 and n. 9, 12, 21–26, 28, 29 n. 77, 30, 34
 Kumme, 25
 Kurunta, 23, 24 n. 58

 Laertes, 84 n. 42
 LAMMA, 23–24, 29
 land, 23, 72, 84, 87, 148–149, 152, 237, 246, 250, 261, 263, 358, 366, 368
 Lapyths, 124–125
 laurel, scepter of, 75–76, 225, 246, 308
 Leda, 112, 167 n. 147
 Lefkandi, 180
 Leimonis, 244
 lemma, genealogical, 4, 139–140, 160, 176; “oral lemma”, 160, 166, 170
 lemmatization, 160, 165
 Lepreus, 125
 Lesbian dialect, 181, 183
 Lesbos, 182
 Lesches of Lesbos, 97, 303
 Lethe, 56
 Leto, 92 n. 2, 236–237, 245
 Leucippides, 171 n. 182
 Libya, 222
Life of Dionysios Periegetes, 319
 Linus, 91, 362
 Livius, Titus, 356 n. 39

 Livius Andronicus, 344
 Locris (East, Western, Opuntian), 161, 182, 200, 305–306
 Longinus (pseudo-), 5, 108
 On the Sublime, 104, 257 n. 13, 262 and n. 25, 265, 325
 love stories, 241, 243
 Lucian
 Hesiodus, 107, 240
 Lucilius, 351
 Lucretius, 351, 356, 357 and n. 42, 359
 Lycaon, 363
 Lycidas, 220 n. 2
 Lydia, 32 and n. 91
 lyric poetry, 4, 99, 200–201
 Lysippus, 257 n. 13

 Macedonia, 278
 Macrobius, 356
 magic, 44, 155, 214
 Magnes, 115
Mahabharata, 20
Maiestas, 370–372
 Mallos, 122, 242
 Manilius, 351, 360–361, 365 n. 71
 mankind, 14–15, 19, 21, 59–62, 72–73, 76–81, 90, 113, 227 n. 26, 235 n. 51, 248, 250, 286, 357
 mantic, 93, 121–123, 130, 286, 308, 362
 Mantichus, 179, 181, 182 and n. 2
 Manto, 122
 Marduk, 13, 26 n. 70, 45 n. 21
Margites, 92, 96 n. 11, 108, 298, 342
 marriage, 28 n. 76, 76, 85, 97, 113–114, 164, 167–168, 173, 177, 208, 240, 243
 Mars, 363
 Martial, 351
 Masnes, 32 n. 89
Maxims of Ptahhotep, 17 and n. 35
 Maximus Tyrius, 240
 Medusa, 57, 209
 Megacleides, 101, 104 and n. 32, 323–325

- Megacles, 323 n. 35
 Mekone, 59, 60 n. 65
 Melampodids, 121, 122
 Melampous, 93, 115, 121–122
 Melaneus, 168, 214
 Meleager, 126
 Meliai, 235 n. 51
 Melicertes / Palaemon, 306
 Melkathros, 12
melpein, 301 and n. 79; *see also*
 dancing *and* singing
 Menander Rhetor, 240
 Menelaus, 113, 204, 214, 217, 261
 Mesopotamia, 19, 27, 45 n. 21
 Mestra, 114–115, 164 n. 133, 167,
 214–216, 249 n. 91
 metals and metallurgy, 16, 67, 80,
 130, 145
 metamorphoses, 114, 167–168, 177,
 215, 235
 Metis, 25, 47, 50, 67 and n. 87, 69,
 207, 210–211, 372
 metre, 116, 179, 191–194, 196, 198,
 200, 267 n. 36
Metus, 370–371
 Midas, 300
 Miletus, 31, 242
 Mimnermus
 Nanno, 241 n. 65
 Minos, 168
Minyas, 126–128
 Mnemosyne, 38, 42–44, 69 n. 90,
 275
 Mnesiepes Inscription, 307–308
 Moirae, 56 and n. 53
 Molione, 167
 Momus (Blame), 56 and n. 52
 monsters, 11–14, 22–23, 31–32, 46,
 57–58, 65–66, 208–209, 232, 351
 month-names, 193, 289
 Mopsus, 122, 176
 Morus (Doom), 55
 Moschopoulos, Manuel, 341 n. 105
 Moschus (addressee in Archestratus'
 of Gela poem), 156
 Mount Haemus, 237
 — Hazzi, 12, 24, 32, 35
 — Helicon, and Heliconian (Muses),
 37 and n. 1, 75, 86, 88, 92 n. 3, 93,
 132, 148, 151, 155, 181, 212, 219,
 222–223, 224 and n. 17, 246, 247
 and n. 86, 277–278, 281–287, 289,
 300 and n. 77, 307, 309, 317, 324
 n. 39, 336, 362–363
 — Kanzura, 12
 — Kasios, 12, 30, 32–33, 35
 — Mimas, 237
 — Olympus, 37 and n. 1, 45, 66, 69
 n. 90, 139, 209, 211–212, 237,
 278, 281, 285, 289, 295 n. 64, 309,
 328, 364, 371
 — Parnassus, 124, 168, 200
 — Parnes, 198
 — Pelion, 128
 — Pindus, 251
 — Saphon, 12, 13 n. 20
 — Tmarus, 250
 Musaeus, 91, 100
 Muses, 2, 37–44, 47–48, 51–52, 53
 and n. 45, 57–58, 61–62, 68–70,
 72–73, 75 and n. 16, 86–88, 92
 n. 3, 93, 102–103, 105, 132–135,
 137, 140–144, 148, 150–151, 155,
 158 and n. 104, 168, 171–172,
 206, 208–209, 212–213, 216, 219,
 222–227, 230, 233 n. 48, 239–
 240, 246, 255 and n. 10, 256, 259,
 271–272, 275–278, 280–289, 300
 and n. 77, 307–309, 317–318, 320
 and n. 30, 335, 343, 345 and n. 12,
 347, 349–350, 360, 362, 369–372
 Myous, 242
 Naevius, 343
 narratology, 132, 138, 204, 205 n. 9,
 222, 247
 narrator, *see* voice
Naupactia, 112, 127 n. 70
 Nauplius, 125
 Nausicaa, 164 n. 133
 Near Eastern culture, 1–2, 9–35, 71
 n. 4, 78, 113, 128, 309
 neighbours, 74, 84, 88, 149, 251, 355
 Neleus, 121

- Nemean lion, 57–58, 208
 Nemesis, 56, 81, 250 n. 95, 359
nepios, 76, 81, 228
 Neptunus, 365
 Nereids, 57, 163, 209, 260, 337–338
 Nereus, 56–57, 69
 Nessus, 217
 Nestor, 214, 217, 254–255
 Nestor of Laranda, 30 n. 85
 Nicander, 219, 228
 Nicanor, 320–321
 Nicippe, 250
 Nicocles, 301
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 298, 299 n. 73, 348
 Night, *see* Nyx
 nightingale, 82 and n. 40, 145, 205, 230, 353
 Ninurta, 13
 Niobe, 105, 244–245, 260
 nominative, 169, 189
 Nonnus of Panopolis
 Dionysiaks, 30 and n. 85, 31, 34
 North West Greek dialect (NWG), 182, 184–187, 189–190, 199–200
 Notus, 140
 nymphs, 49, 58, 168, 235 n. 51, 236 n. 53, 239, 250, 361
 Nyx, 45, 48, 55 and nn. 48 and 50–51, 56 and nn. 53–54, 64, 206

obelos, 318, 338–339
 Oceanids, 209–210, 236
 Oceanus, 46 and n. 25, 63 n. 73, 69 n. 90, 235–236, 239, 246
 octopus, 85, 184
 Odysseus, 70, 76 n. 18, 87, 112, 127, 134, 152, 154–155, 166, 170, 172 n. 185, 174, 207, 266, 277
 Oechalia, 217, 373
 Oedipus, 63 n. 76, 118, 247 n. 86
 Oeneus, 168, 215
 Oizus (Woe), 56
 Olba, 32
 Olen, 186
 Olmeius, 246
 Olympic games, 258, 295 n. 64

 Olympus, *see* Mount Olympus
 Oneiroi, 55
 Onomacritus, 98 n. 16
 Oppian
 Halieutica, 30–32, 34
 oracle(s), 98 n. 16, 122, 184–185, 194 n. 29, 200 and n. 40, 216 n. 46
 oral poetry, 20, 26, 190, 273–277, 281, 283–284
 Orchomenus in Boeotia, 305–306
 Orestes, 214
 Orion, 130
 Orpheus, 91, 100
 Orthus, 57
 Ossa, 237
 Othrys, 251
 Ovid, 219, 360 n. 53
 Ars amandi, 343, 349, 351, 359 n. 48, 364 n. 64, 367
 Epistulae ex Ponto, 347 n. 18, 372 and n. 80, 373–374
 Fasti, 356, 359–360, 370
 Heroides, 365
 Metamorphoses, 45, 353 n. 30, 362–365, 368, 373
 Remedia Amoris, 241
 Tristia, 351
 oxen, 85, 193, 251

 Pagasae, 110
 Palaemon, *see* Melicertes
 Pallas, *see* Athena
 Pamphilos, 124
 Pan, 30
Panaristos, 2, 83, 87–88, 90
 Panathenaea, 5, 97, 245 n. 82, 294, 296–297, 311
 Pandora, 14, 15 and n. 25, 16, 21, 39, 47, 58, 59 n. 63, 61–62, 67–68, 71–72, 76 and n. 21, 77 and n. 22, 78–79, 86, 136, 159–160, 205, 231–232, 248, 250, 357
 pan-Hellenism, 3, 37 n. 1, 38 93, 95, 111, 113–114, 132, 136–138, 141, 158, 171, 173–175, 177, 200, 275–278, 281, 283–289, 295 n. 64, 296, 302, 309

- Panedes, 262
 Papinius, Publius, 354
 papyri and parchment codices:
 Hesiod, 95, 96 n. 11, 107, 112
 and n. 48, 115, 120, 183, 200, 242
 n. 69, 325, 342, 354
 P.Achmim (*Theogony*), 3 107, 329
 n. 51
 P.Ibscher col. I (*Katabasis of
 Theseus and Peirithous?*), 126–
 128
 P.Oxy. 2075 (*Catalogue of
 Women*), 102 n. 29
 P.Oxy. 2354 (*Catalogue of
 Women*), 105
 P.Oxy. 2487 (*Catalogue of
 Women*), 102 n. 29
 P.Oxy. 2495 (*Wedding of Ceyx*),
 125
 P.Oxy. 3224 (*Works and Days*),
 339 and n. 93
 P.Oxy. 3537, 107 and n. 40
 P.Oxy. 4652 (glossary of the *Shield
 of Heracles*), 325
 P.Vindob. G 19815 (*Theogony and
 Works and Days*), 107
 —: others
 P.Lit.Lond. 191 (*Certamen
 Homeri et Hesiodi*), 314
 P.Mich. 2754 (*Certamen Homeri
 et Hesiodi*), 298 n. 70, 314
 P.Oxy. 1241 (list of grammarians),
 334
 P.Oxy. 2506 (Chamaeleon), 316
 n. 15
 P.Oxy. 4648 (Callim. *epigr.* 27 Pf.),
 257–259, 261 n. 23
 P.Thessaloniki (Derveni Papyrus:
 Orphic cosmogony), 30, 67
 n. 87
 paraenetical discourse, 81, 205 and
 n. 6, 228, 230
 — speeches in Homer, 71
 parallelism (*parisisis*), 268
parataxis, 158 n. 104, 163, 177
 Paris, 260, 338
 Parmenides, 329
 Parnassus, *see* Mount Parnassus
 paronomasia, 64, 268
 Parus, 307
 Parrhasia, 233
 Parthenius river, 244
 parthenogenesis, 55, 59
 Pasiphae, 362
 past of myth, 226, 241–242
 Patroclus, 47, 257
 patronymics, 169, 195
 Pausanias, 92 n. 3, 93 and n. 5, 94,
 102–105, 107 and n. 39, 112, 119–
 121, 126–127, 182, 186, 291, 300
 and n. 77, 306, 311, 317, 319–321,
 324 n. 39, 325, 336 and n. 77
 Pausanias (addressee of Empedocles’
 poem), 156
 Pegasus, 57–58, 209, 351
 Peirithous, 93–94, 98, 126–127
 Peisistratids, 98 and n. 16, 292, 294–
 297, 301–303
 Peisistratus, Peisistratean recension
 of Homer’s poems, 97–98, 292–
 293
 Pelasgians, 249
 Pelasgus, 112–113
 Peleus, 94 n. 7, 168, 215 n. 45, 216
 Peloponnese, 161, 218
 Pelops, 113
 Peneius, 236 n. 53, 237
 Penelope, 77 n. 24, 164 n. 132, 166,
 169 n. 173, 173 and n. 187, 174,
 207 n. 19
 Penthesileia, 106
 Pergamon, 101–102, 105–106, 108,
 119
 Periboia, 168
 Periclymenus, 214, 241 n. 66
 Perieres, 115
 Peripatus, 6, 101–102, 104, 314–316,
 323, 325
 perjury, 65, 75, 81, 152
 Permessus, 246
 Pero, 122
 Persephone, 126
 Perses, 3, 71–76, 81–88, 131, 137,
 144, 149–152, 154–157, 175–176,

- 205, 227, 230, 249 n. 93, 251, 271,
309–310, 320, 349–350
- Perseus, 58
- Persian literature, medieval, 5, 310
and n. 105
- Persius, 345–346
- personification, 56, 75 n. 17, 82, 195,
220, 232, 235, 250 n. 95, 266, 353
n. 30
- Pessinous, 32
- Phaeacians, 154–155, 163, 172
n. 185, 277
- Phaedrus, 328
- Phaenias of Eresos, 303
- PHEME, 89
- Phemius, 87
- Phaeton, 130; sisters of, 362
- Pherecydes of Syros, 99, 100 n. 25
- Philammon, 186
- Philetadas, 230
- Philip II of Macedonia, 267 n. 36,
348
- Philo of Byblos, 12, 28, 34
- Philochorus, 92 n. 2, 300–302
- Philodemus, 120, 123, 365 n. 70
On Piety, 127, 365
On Poems, 127, 260 n. 20
- Philomela, 362
- philotes*, 48 and n. 30, 69; personi-
fied, 56 and n. 54
- Phineus, 120, 215
- Phocaea, 291
- Phocis, 192
- Phocylides, 128
- Phoebe, 208
- Phoebus, *see* Apollo
- Phoenicians, 154–155
- Phorcys, 57, 123, 208–209
- Phoronis*, 112, 127, 130
- Phrixus, 125
- Phrygius, 242–243
- Pieria, 43, 73, 142, 259, 317
— (woman), 242–243
- Pindar, 100 nn. 21–22, 153–155, 194
Isthmians, 25 n. 67, 99, 194 n. 25
Nemeans, 148 n. 65, 153 n. 84
Olympians, 34, 258
- Pythians*, 30 and n. 84, 99, 153
n. 84, 194, 196
frr., 97 n. 15, 99, 127, 194, 235
n. 52, 236, 372 n. 82
- Pittacus, 230
- Planudes, Maximus, 341 n. 105
- Plato, 43, 101, 226 n. 22, 257 n. 13,
354, 365
Ion, 264 n. 31, 313
Laws, 77 n. 23, 247 n. 88
Phaedrus, 255 n. 10
Republic, 247 n. 88, 280, 297, 299
Symposium, 328–330, 331 and
n. 53
- [Plato]
Hipparchus, 297
- Pleiades, 129, 148, 213, 215, 261,
263, 266
- Pliny the Elder, 129, 361
- Plutarch, 104, 125
Banquets of the Seven Sages, 303,
305
commentary on *Works and Days*,
6, 98, 315, 341, 354
Life of Numa, 308
Life of Theseus, 98 n. 17, 124, 315
n. 10, 356 n. 37
Pythias' oracles, 185
Table talk, 344
Vitae Homeri, 290 n. 48
- [Plutarch]
De Homero, 254 n. 4
- poetics, 131, 141, 144, 146, 150–151,
158, 176, 219–221, 238, 295
- poetology, 132–155, 175
- Pollianus, 95
- Pollux, 94
- Polymnia, 370
- polyptoton, 268
- Pontus, 46, 56–57, 67 n. 86, 69, 206,
208
- Porthaon, 167, 168
- Poseidon, 48 n. 30, 52, 54, 112 and
n. 47, 167, 209, 213–214, 216 and
n. 46, 235, 236 n. 53, 251; *see also*
Neptunus
- Potiphar, 168

- poverty, 85–86
 Praxiphanes, 101–103, 316 and
 n. 16, 317, 321
 prepositions, 187–188, 190
 preverb, 190
 priamel, 170
 Proclus, 94 n. 6, 290 n. 48, 299, 315,
 340, 341 and n. 105
 Prodicus of Phocaea or Samos, 126
 and n. 68
 proems, *see* Hesiod
 Proetus, 244; daughters of, 122, 167
 n. 147, 217 n. 50, 362
 Prometheus, 3, 14, 15 and n. 25, 21,
 39, 41, 47, 51, 58–62, 71–72, 76,
 81, 90, 113, 140, 159–160, 204,
 210, 212, 216, 226 n. 24, 230–232,
 248, 357, 359, 362
 Propertius, 219–220, 345, 363
 n. 60, 364 n. 67, 366, 368, 373
 n. 83
 prophecy, 15, 18, 25 and n. 67, 27,
 46, 121, 210, 216 n. 46, 225, 235,
 246, 247 and n. 86, 286
Prophecy of Nefertiti, 15 and n. 27
 Protogonus / Phanes, 30
 Provençal literature, 5, 310 and
 n. 105
 proverbs, 17–18, 72, 255, 353, 355
 Prudentius, 353 n. 30
 Ps. Probus, 334 n. 66
 Ptolemy IX, 334 n. 68
 Ptolemy Philadelphus, 235, 238, 369
 Ptoon, 302
Pudor, 370–371
 Pylus, 121, 215, 217
 Pyrrha, 159, 165
 Pythagorici, 123, 345

 Quintilian, 253–255, 324 n. 39, 347–
 348, 352–353, 355

 races, myth of, 14–16, 20 and n. 47,
 22, 24, 29, 49, 71–72, 78–82, 90,
 144–147, 158 and n. 103, 145–
 147, 168–169, 204–205, 227
 n. 26, 230–231, 247, 259, 357,
 359 and n. 51, 363, 367–368; *see*
 also Golden Age
 Re, 15
Reverentia, 370–371
 Rhadamantys, 129, 168
 rhapsodes, 92, 95, 97–98, 103, 105,
 111, 116–118, 123, 297–301, 313
 Rhea, 28, 50, 210, 233–234
 Rhion, 305
 Rhodes, 218
 Rhodian *chelidonismos*, 200 and
 n. 40
 rhyme, 43, 61, 267–268
 rhythm, 38, 43, 162
 ring-composition, 40, 67, 72, 137,
 142, 153, 209, 213
 ritual, 16, 22 n. 55, 24 and n. 59, 28,
 29 and n. 77, 33, 45 n. 21, 50, 136,
 245, 306, 309
 rivers, 56, 141, 185, 236
 Rome, 101, 104, 219, 343 n. 1, 344, 352,
 354, 358 and n. 44, 368–369, 371

 sacrifice, 14, 23–24, 60, 76, 80, 128,
 136, 185, 214, 226 n. 24, 244, 367
 sailing, 86 and n. 49, 87, 151, 153–
 155, 291, 292 and n. 52, 310
 Salmoneus, 167, 214–215, 244
 Samus, 97
 Sanchuniathon, 12
 Sappho, 182, 254, 258, 267
 Sardinia, 236
 Sarpedon, 168, 214
 Saturn, 358, 366, 370–371
 Sauska, 23, 30
 Scaean gates, 214
 Scaliger, J.J., 257–258
 Schoineus, 216 n. 46
 scholarship, ancient, 5–6, 95–96,
 101–106, 108, 119–120, 125, 201,
 222 n. 9, 228–229, 238 n. 62, 239,
 313–342
 scholia, 6, 195
 — to Apollonius Rhodius, 94, 119–
 120, 331 n. 53
 — to Callimachus' *Aitia*, 223–224,
 239

- to Dionysius Thrax, 104, 294
n. 58, 314 n. 5, 325
- to Euripides, 123, 257 n. 13
- to Hesiod, 341–342; *Shield of Heracles*, 325, 341; *Theogony*, 207 n. 19, 223 n. 12, 256, 330, 331 and n. 53, 333–334 and n. 66, 335, 336 and n. 74, 337 and n. 80, 340 and n. 101, 341, 343; *Works and days*, 102–103, 144 n. 47, 304, 315, 316 n. 16 (Tzetzes), 318 n. 20 (Tzetzes), 331, 335–339, 341
- to Homer, 216, 334, 339; *Iliad*, 30–31 n. 85, 56 n. 52, 105 n. 33, 106 n. 35, 195 n. 32, 254, 260, 264–266, 268, 332 n. 55, 337 n. 80, 338; *Odyssey*, 261
- to Pindar, 120–121; *Isth.*, 99, 306; *Nem.*, 301, 314; *Pyth.*, 100 n. 22
- Scilla, 362
- sea, 38, 54, 56–57, 72, 86, 92, 150, 152, 154, 156; personified, *see* Pontus
- seafaring, *see* sailing
- Sekhmet, 15
- Selene, 168, 199
- Seleucus of Alexandria, 104, 108, 325, 337, 341
- semeia* *see* critical signs in manuscripts
- Semele, 361 n. 54, 364 n. 67
- Seneca, 344 n. 8
De beneficiis, 343
Epistulae, 343, 344
Medea, 368
- seriation, 165 and n. 139
- Servius, 108 n. 44, 358
- Seth, 13 n. 20
- sex, 85, 122, 167–168, 240
- shame, *see* *aidos*
- shepherd(s), 5, 18, 132, 133 and n. 9, 141, 222–224, 246, 277, 308–310, 348
- “Shulgi’s” Prophecy, 15 n. 27
- Siamese twins, 214
- Sibylla, 364
- Sicily, Sicilian cities, 99, 226, 242–243
- Silenus, 362
- Simonides, 92, 99, 152 and n. 81
- singer(s), 2, 33–35, 82, 91–92, 145, 161, 181, 188, 225, 285–286, 301, 314, 362
- singing, of poets, 55, 92, 171–172, 179, 193, 212, 229, 241, 246, 282, 285, 293, 301, 314, 358, 362, 369; of Muses, 39, 42–44, 70, 206, 208, 226, 240, 278, 282, 288, 301 and n. 79, 350
- Sirens, 167
- Sisyphus, 216
- sky personified, *see* Uranus
- Smyrna, 290–294, 307
- snake, 11, 16, 31, 57–58, 65, 113, 184
- Socrates, 255 n. 10, 280, 297, 299
- Solon, 45, 152 and n. 80
- song, 2–3, 10, 22–26, 32–33, 37–38, 42–44, 47, 53, 61, 68, 70, 73, 74 n. 14, 75, 84, 86–87, 92 nn. 2–3, 132 and n. 6, 133, 137, 139, 141, 148, 152, 155, 162, 172, 175, 206 and n. 14, 207, 223, 225 and n. 18, 226 n. 21, 246, 255, 257, 259, 282, 284, 286–288, 301, 304, 348, 350, 358, 362, 363, 373; *see also* singing
- Song of Kingship*, 24
— of Kumarbi, 10, 22–26
— of LAMMA, 23
— of Silver, 23
— of the Sea, 24
— of Ullikummi, 12, 23, 24 and n. 61, 26, 32
- sophistai*, 313
- Sophocles
Antigone, 47
King Oedipus, 245 n. 80
- Sown Warriors, 264 n. 31
- Sparta, 182
- Sphinx, 57, 193, 351
- sphragis, 151 and n. 75, 154–156, 157 n. 97

- Stasinus of Cyprus, 97
 stars, 84, 129–130, 232 n. 45, 260, 261, 361, 371
 Statius, 353 n. 30, 354
 Silvae, 343, 354, 372 n. 80
 Thebaid, 372 n. 80
 Stephanus of Byzantium, 123
 Sterope, 168
 Stesichorus, 99 n. 19, 104, 200 and n. 40, 201 and n. 42, 316, 323–324
 Cycnus, 99, 324
 Palinodia, 316
 Stoics, 6, 259, 325, 327, 340, 342, 359–360
 Strabo, 32 n. 91, 290
 Stratonice, 168, 214
 Strophades, 244
 Strophia, 236 n. 53
 Styx, 52, 58, 65, 204, 209–210, 373
 Suda, 93 and n. 4, 94 and n. 7, 95, 97 n. 15, 108, 130, 290 n. 48, 314 n. 4, 334, 339 n. 92, 341
Sumerian Agricultural Handbook, 17 and n. 36
 — *Instructions of Suruppak*, 17 and n. 36
 Syracuse, 97
 Syria, 10, 27, 32, 34

tarpalli / tarpanalli, 22–25, 28, 29 n. 77
 Tartarus, 57, 64–65, 67, 204, 209, 328–330, 331 and n. 53
 Telamon, 99, 125
 Telchines, 224, 228–229, 240
 Telecleides
 Hesiodoi, 101
 Telemachus, 261
 Tereus, 362
 Terpander, 182
 Tessub, 10, 12, 22–29
 Teucer, 257
 Teuthras, 216
 Tethys, 235–236
 Thamyras, 47
 Thanatos, 55, 65
 Thaummas, 57

 Thebes, 80, 111, 113, 121–122, 181, 217, 245
 Theiodamas, 125
 Themis, 69 and n. 90, 371–372
 Themistius, 332 n. 54
 Theocritus, 219, 238 n. 61, 352
 Idylls, 220 n. 2, 369
 theodicy, 21, 359
 Theodorus (addressee of Dionysius Chalkous' poem), 156
 Theognis and *Theognidea*, 71, 77 n. 23, 128, 156, 230, 310
 theogonic poetry, 32, 42, 133 n. 9, 138–141, 158–160, 175, 227, 233 nn. 47–48, 235, 238, 282, 308, 363
Theogony of Dunnu, 13
 Theophrastus, 101–102, 317
 Theseus, 93, 98, 105, 124–127
 Thespieae in Boeotia, 305–307
 Thessalian dialect, 181, 190
 Thessaly, 110, 192, 194, 196, 197 n. 35, 249, 275
 Thestorides of Phocaea, 97
 Little Iliad, 97
 Phocais, 92, 97
 Thetis, 25 n. 67, 94 n. 7
 Thor, 14 n. 21
 Thrace, 237, 289
 Thrasymedes, 214
 Thucydides, 182, 284, 285 n. 34, 287 n. 38, 288, 301, 305
 Tiamat, 13
 Tibullus, 366–368
 Tigris, 12
 Timandre, 115
 Tiresias, 122, 245 and n. 80, 247 and nn. 86–87, 248 n. 89
Titanomachia, 127 n. 70
 Titanomachy, 67, 206, 210–211, 237–238, 245–246, 351, 372
 Titans, 2, 16 n. 31, 20 n. 47, 22, 28, 46, 48 and n. 29, 49, 51, 53, 62–64, 69 nn. 90 and 92, 206, 210–211, 237, 245, 326, 351, 360–361, 372
 Trachis, 125

- trickster, 21, 59, 60 n. 67
 Triopas, 249, 251 and n. 97
 Triptolemus, 248
 Trojan war, 80, 105–106, 113–114,
 121–122, 141, 160, 166 n. 142,
 169, 173, 204, 214–215, 241, 292,
 351, 363–364
 Troy, 86, 115, 121–122, 151, 176,
 217, 289, 364 n. 67
 Tryphon, 66, 341–342
 Tydeus, 168, 215
 Tylus, 32 n. 89
 Tyndareus, 113, 115
 Typhoeus, 46, 51, 57, 59, 65 and
 n. 82, 66 and n. 85, 67, 140, 206,
 210, 237 and n. 57, 351
 Typhon, 11–12, 13 n. 20, 14, 28, 30
 and n. 85, 32, 33, 66
 Typhonomachy, 207
 Tyro, 112 and n. 47, 114, 165–166,
 180 n. 1, 214–216
 Tyrtaeus, 200 and n. 40
 Tzetzes, John, 94 and nn. 6–7, 123
 and n. 64, 290 n. 48, 341 n. 105;
 see also scholia to Hesiod
 Life of Hesiod, 305, 306 n. 93
 Ugarit, 12, 17
 Ugaritic culture, 2, 24, 26, 32 n. 92,
 42
 Ullikummi, 10–11, 14 n. 21, 23, 25–
 26, 30 and n. 85, 32
 underworld, 10 n. 5, 14, 112, 126–
 127, 169
 unitarian criticism, 116
 Uranus, 2, 10, 11–12, 23, 25, 28, 30,
 44, 46, 48 and n. 30, 49 and n. 34,
 50, 51 and n. 36, 56 n. 54, 57, 67
 n. 86, 70, 206, 208, 210–211, 239,
 246, 340
 urbanization, 250–252
 Valgius, 367
 Varro, M. Ter., 344
 De lingua latina, 344 n. 7
 De re rustica, 344 n. 7
 Varro Atacinus, 358
 Velleius Paterculus, 256, 346 and
 n. 18, 365
 Venus, 362
 Vesta, 326
 violence, 41, 46–47, 67, 80–81, 219,
 237, 367; personified, 244
 Virgil, 219, 353 n. 30, 357, 368
 Aeneid, 346 n. 15, 362 and n. 59,
 373
 Bucolics, 362, 363 n. 60, 368
 Georgics, 56, 253 n. 2, 267 and
 n. 37, 346 n. 15, 357–359,
 363
 Vitae Arati, 259–261
 Vitae Homeri, 93 n. 4, 94, 97 n. 15,
 290 and n. 48, 291–293, 299, 315,
 316 and n. 14, 337 n. 80
 voice, authoritative, 72, 88, 222, 227;
 — autobiographical, 6, 71, 88, 136,
 151, 156–157, 211, 222, 223 and
 n. 11, 224 and n. 14, 271–272,
 278–279, 315, 320, 346
 — didactic, 227–232
 — gnomic, 222
 — mantic, 362
 — moralizing, 222
 — narrative, 3, 131–133, 138–141,
 144–145, 150, 159, 175, 203, 205,
 210–212, 219, 222–233, 239–240,
 243, 248–249, 272, 363
 — poetic, 222–232
 Vulcanus, 363
 water, 233, 246–247, 326 n. 46, 331
 n. 53, 334; personified, 13, 235
 wealth, 84, 99, 154, 249 n. 93, 278,
 304, 313, 367–368
 West Semitic culture, 12, 24, 26–27,
 31, 32 n. 92
 winds, 141, 289–290, 366
 wisdom literature, 17–18, 71, 96,
 128, 176, 268, 346 n. 15, 352–353,
 356
 woman from Colophon, 364
 Word (Indic goddess), 38
 work (*ergon*), 71–72, 76, 81–82, 84,
 86–88, 90, 251, 359

- Xanthus of Lydia, 32 n. 91
Xenomedes, 222
Xenophanes of Colophon, 99, 123,
 364–365
Xuthus, 159
- Zancle, 243
Zechariah (prophet), 15 n. 25
Zeno of Citium, 6, 101, 325–328,
 331–335, 340, 342
Zenodotus of Alexandria, 334
Zenodotus of Ephesus, 101, 222 n. 9,
 260, 332, 333 and nn. 60, 334 and
 n. 63, 337–338
Zenodotus of Mallos, 334
- Zephyrus, 140, 338
Zeus, 2–3, 10 n. 5, 14, 21–22, 25
 and n. 67, 28, 30, 32, 37–40, 42,
 44 and n. 19, 47, 49–70, 72–90,
 108–109, 113, 138, 142, 143 and
 nn. 44 and 46, 148, 159, 167, 174,
 194, 203–204, 206 and n. 13,
 208–211, 213–214, 216, 218,
 231–232, 233 and n. 47, 234 and
 n. 49, 236–239, 240 n. 64, 244,
 248, 256, 259, 305, 309, 320, 357,
 359, 361 n. 54, 362, 369; *see also*
 Jupiter
Zohak, 14 n. 21
Zoroastrian traditions, 14, 20 n. 47